

Bhopal Affairs.

A

DEFENCE

BY

SYED SEDDIQUE HOSSEIN.

Calcutta.

PRINTED BY BEHARY LALL BANNERJEE
AT MESSRS. J. G. CHATTERJEE & CO.'S PRESS,
44, AMHERST STREET.

1888.

PREFACE.

Sir Lepel Griffin K. C. S. I., the Resident for the Central India Agency, brought two principal charges against me; namely—

(1) The compilation of the Khutab (books) which are hostile towards the British Government;

(2) The mismanagement of the state arising from my interference with the state affairs.

In addition to the above, the Resident verbally spoke to me of the complaints, forwarded against me, by the Sultan Jehan Begum, her husband, her two half-brothers, and other state-members, officers and subjects of the state and these form a branch of the second charge.

The explanation was given in regard to the two charges, which were brought against me, from time to time. A brief explanation was given to the Resident with a memorandum addressed to him by the State, in reply to each item of the charge.

Each charge was met by me, in detail in reply with a general explanation in vindication of my conduct. Another explanation was submitted to the Ruler of the State.

The explanation forwarded to the Resident at Indore and the Ruler at Bhopal, is as follows:—

PART 1.

Section I.—A letter to the address of the Ruler of Bhopal, stating briefly my case, with a request to forward my explanations to the Government of India.

Section II.—My defence with regard to the compilation of the *Mujmua-khutab* which is alleged to be seditious.

Section III.—

- (a). The despatch of the telegram by Sir Lepel Griffin charging me for having *connection* with the false Mehdi at Soudan.
- (b) The charge brought against me by Din Mahomed, a Mahomedan convert.
- (c) The compilation of the *Iqtrab-us-Saya*.

Section IV.—

- (a) The remarks made by Sir Lepel on the books compiled and published by me forwarded to the State, by Col. Kincaid, with a memorandum, dated the 31st August 1885.
- (b) The explanation in detail submitted to the Ruler.
- (c) A brief explanation, with the memorandum, dated the 2nd September 1885, of the State, forwarded to the Resident.

Section V.—A general explanation on the books compiled and composed by me.

PART II.

Section I.—An explanation of all the charges of mismanagement brought against me for interference with the State affairs.

Section II.—General charges and defence.

Appendix (A).—The FUTWAS (opinions) of ALIMS (the Mahomedan learned Doctors) of India, on the compilation of my books.

Appendix (B).—An “Extract from the supplement to the “Advocate of India” (a Bombay journal) in support of my explanation to the charges brought by Sir Lepel Griffin regarding the books.

Appendix (C).—Extracts from my autobiography.

S. H.

PART I.

SEC. I.—*A letter to the address of the Ruler of Bhopal, stating briefly my case, with a request to forward my explanations to the Government of India.*

To

HER HIGHNESS THE NAWAB SHAH JEHAN BEGUM

G. C. S. I. and C. I. E.

The Ruler of Bhopal.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HIGHNESS.

1. It is with feelings of no ordinary regret I find that within a few years after the advent of Sir Lepel Griffin, the State of Bhopal has been condemned and Your Highness has been shocked to find a state of things never before dreamt of. It has pained me to see that to a great extent the causes of your woes and miseries are attributed to me. The inevitable *Kismut* will have its own way but I trust Your Highness will lose no faith in Allah who giveth and taketh away. I have full confidence in the justice of the liberal British Government and I would strongly insist on Your Highness to lay your case before His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India. His Lordship, I doubt not, will find the way to redress your wrongs.

2. Fully sympathising with Your Highness in your present woes and miseries I submit the following explanations, the copies of which were forwarded to Sir Lepel Griffin for his favorable consideration.

3. I shall take the liberty to offer here my sincere thanks to Your Highness for the many favors and inestimable blessings which I enjoyed until 1881.

4. Under the regime of the late lamented Nawab Secandar Begum, I accepted a post in the State and gradually rose to the top-most ladder in the service. I need not trouble Your Highness with the services which I rendered in my various capacities, as they are well known to you. By the grace of Allah Your Highness led me to the hymeneal altar in 1871 and since then I had the good fortune to live under the smiles of the paternal Paramount Power up to and until the advent of Sir Lepel Griffin in the Central India.

5. Immediately after my marriage, the British Government was kind enough to confer on me the title of Nawab Walah Jah Amir-ul-Mulk and a *Khilut*. The despatch of the Government dated the 15th October 1872 to your address runs thus :—

* * * * *

“ And that the Nawab, in gratitude for this splendid boon bestowed on him by the British Government, should endeavour to increase the good reputation of the Ruler, and to advance the interests and prosperity of the people with all his talents and ability.”

“ It is open to Your Highness and Nawab to maintain the prosperity and progress of the State, which is already a pattern of good management to other States and to continue on that path of progress already so well commenced.”

6. In 1877 on the assumption of the Title of the Empress of India by Her Most Gracious Majesty proclaimed at Delhi, the British Government ordained a salute of seventeen guns for me in token of personal distinction.

7. The Agent to the Governor General addressed a letter to you on the 3rd March 1877 which speaks of me in the following terms.

“ Remember me kindly to the Nawab who is earnest to make Bhopal and the Shah Jehan Begum famous. I am sure he will not fail in energy.”

The Urdu *Kharita*, dated the 1st August 1882, sent by the Viceroy to your address runs thus :—

“ * * * * * In reference to your letter expressing your intention to join the battle-field and to render every help to the Government with men and money and moreover the hearty co-operation of the Nawab-consort in promoting your views and sympathising with the Government, I would say that the Government highly appreciates and acknowledges such a laudable proposal with thanks.”

8. Lord Ripon in his *Kharita*, dated the 9th November 1882, conveyed his thanks to me for my good wishes and congratulations to the Government after the defeat of Araby Pasha.

Col. Kincaid in his letter, dated the 27th June 1884, recognised my services thus.

“ In this very important matter admirable efforts have been made by Your Highness and the Nawab-consort to complete the plan of opening a Railway line from Bhopal to Gwalior—it is highly laudable and worth mentioning.”

9. After my marriage, Col. Osborne, the Political Agent, wrote to Your Highness in his memorandum dated the 30th June 1871.

“ I have received your Yad-dast to the effect that Khan Shaheb (meaning me) has been doing work in your Court. I am very glad to hear of this arrangement and your views on this subject are quite proper and desirable.” During the incumbency of General Daly, Walton, Watson, and Col. Bannerman, at Indore, and Col. Osborne, Barstow, Prideaux and Bannerman at Sehore, the administration was never spoken of in disparaging terms but on the other hand it was extolled before the world.

10. It strikes me that Sir Lepel Griffin was under the impression that the administration was exclusively in my hand and that Your Highness had very little to do. It is a pity that the Agent to the Governor-General did not take into his consideration the administrative skill which made your name conspicuous before my marriage. It is widely known that the reforms introduced by you, after accession to the throne, and the troubles you undertook at the sacrifice of your health, made your administration popular and laudable in the estimation of the British Government.

If it be conceded that after my marriage I took part in the management by actual interference with the State-affairs, the various reforms which made Bhopal the pattern of good management should be attributed to me. The Political officers of the day did not deem it proper to make a regular inquiry into the charges which are laid against me and the State. An investigation in a regular way is essentially necessary to shew how far the charges can be sustained and it will be incumbent upon the accusers to substantiate their allegations.

11. In 1881 Sir Lepel Griffin came to Bhopal and I went to give him a cordial reception at the Railway Station. I could not make out the reason of his cold and indifferent conduct towards me; but the warm reception he accorded to Ahmed Aly Khan, the husband of the Sultan Jehan Begum, on the first occasion of his visit, struck me that Sir Lepel was quite unlike his predecessors. I need not state the proceedings of Sir Lepel in Bhopal but I cannot help remarking that the protests of Your Highness made my position unsafe and critical. To me he pointed out his finger of scorn, whenever and wherever he met with any opposition in the carrying out of his proposals. The enemies of the State, who had formed an opposition party to thwart the plans of Your Highness and to ruin the State, found an opportunity to give vent to their feelings. They carried tales and acted as spies. Things came to such a pass as to afford an opportunity to men, like Din Mahammed and Mustapha, to rise against me and the State. No stone was left un-

turned to find fault with me and charges were brought against me personally and the State which, to all intents and purposes, was identified with me. I was supposed to have a hand in the administration. In short Sir Lepel took me to be the be-all and end-all of the administration. The private visits of Sir Lepel to the Sultan Jehan were protested by Your Highness and the Resident grew more exasperated. The result of all this is well known to Your Highness. I have been adjudged guilty without a formal inquiry, my books have been condemned as seditious without sufficient proofs and I have been disgraced before the world without a hearing. The prosecution, trial and sentence were virtually in the hands of Sir Lepel.

12. Regarding the books condemned by Sir Lepel, I make myself bold to state here that they have been either misunderstood or falsely represented by the persons to whom reference was made by him. Any learned Mussulman in the service of the Government may come forward to accept my challenge and I shall be fully prepared to shew that the context and the writings are not what have been represented. It is a pity that the loyalty which I have always been shewing to the British Government was not taken into account by Sir Lepel. I have always been loyally attached to the Government, and whenever any occasion arose, I proved myself faithful to the trust imposed on me. In the late Cabul and Egyptian wars I pleaded the cause of the Paramount Power before your Highness and all the resources of the State were put under its disposal. Being fond of literary pursuits

I spent my days in composing, compiling and translating books. Some of these books I presented to the English officers of rank and distinction. The books are alleged to be full of sedition and stink of Wahabeeism. Could a disloyal person or a Wahabee venture to present such books to men like Lord Ripon, knowing full well that he would be taken to task if the books were carefully examined ? The charge of sedition and disloyalty is a very serious one and nothing can be more gratifying to me than to vindicate my conduct before an assembly of learned men well-versed in the Persian, Urdu and Arabic languages. I trust Your Highness will earnestly ask His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India to appoint a commission before whom I shall meet the accusations of Sir Lepel Griffin and conclusively prove that in loyalty I am not inferior to any person.

13. The accompanying explanations will shew that incomplete isolated sentences are quoted to prove that I am disloyal and that I am a Wahabee. As a matter of fact I am neither the one nor the other. The sentences quoted, are the translations from the works of others and wherever an expression of my own views is made, I have strongly insisted on my co-religionists to be friendly to the English Government and explained to them to the best of my power that it is iniquitous to wage war against the British Government. If the views expressed by me breathe a single disloyal word or burn with sedition, I am prepared to accept the verdict of a learned assembly of men after a fair trial. Sir Lepel is not an Arabic scholar and so he

has accepted the views of others. His informants might have misunderstood the passages and their statements should have been accepted with great caution. But alas! things have been pushed on precipitously and I have been the unfortunate victim of these adverse circumstances.

14. The charge of *mismangement* has been brought against me. The explanations submitted to the Resident, I am afraid, did not satisfy him. But how far the charge of *mismanagment* can be brought against me is a question which your Highness will be able to answer. Suffice it, for my purpose, to say, that a charge of this kind needs very strong proofs, especially when a State, like Bhopal, protected by the Paramount Power under a Treaty written in black and white, had never the misfortune of receiving such a stigma for a period of upwards of thirteen years. Your Highness is well aware of the fact how the sworn enmity of the opposition clique in Bhopal has brought ruin on you and me. I am quite surprised to find that the Sultan Jehan turned the table against me. She forgot all the affections shewn by me to her and her children, she forgot all the care and interest which I used to take for her husband, she forgot all the intercessions I made on her behalf before your Highness. In pushing on her animosity against the Ruler she spared no means to bring ruin on me.

15. The explanations are divided into parts and sections for the sake of convenience and reference.

16. The explanations, which I forwarded to the Agent to the Governor General, are hereby submitted

to Your Highness in the hope that they may be sent to the Government of India for reconsideration of my case. I am afraid the Government of India passed an order on the *ex parte* reports and statements of Sir Lepel.

17. The charges of mismanagement and undue interference, brought against me, deserve a careful investigation. Personally I am not sorry for this charge; but a charge of this kind against a state, which was held out to the world as a pattern of good government, is a serious one and the fatal consequences have already overtaken it. To the best of my knowledge, the charges have not been properly investigated and the Paramount Power should be moved to make a thorough inquiry giving every opportunity to me to prove my innocence.

18. It is not proper for me to enumerate here the insults and indignities offered to me. But I cannot help crying that Sir Lepel did not hesitate to "add insult to injury." I was proclaimed guilty and deprived of my title and salute in an open Durbar in the most insulting language. I cut off all communications with the outside world after my disgrace and I pent myself up in a house to avoid any suspicion. But this did not satisfy Sir Lepel. He threatened my expulsion from Bhopal and often repeated his threats before me and Your Highness. I was outrageously insulted and deeply humiliated before men who triumphantly exult at the humiliation of Your Highness. I was ordered to drag the wretched existence of a prisoner immured in a separate house.

I was completely separated from Your Highness without being able to tend you while you were ill and I was called a Wahabee, a rebel, a despot and a sorcerer. I have borne all these insults and indignities with a calm resignation of heart in the hope that British justice will sooner or later find its way to redress the wrongs of an unfortunate man. Life hangs heavily on me but the innocence of my cause keeps up my spirits and I trust that the day is not far distant when my loyalty and devotion to the Paramount Power will be duly appreciated and all these stigmas will be removed.

19. In conclusion I may take the liberty to state that the devotion and loyalty of Your Highness are so well known to the Paramount Power that it is needless for me to say that eventually justice will be meted out to you and that your wrongs will receive redress. It behoves Your Highness to intercede in my favour to secure justice which is vouchsafed to every British subject and I shall feel grateful to the British Government for affording me an opportunity to shew the weakness and impropriety of the charges brought against me.

I beg to remain
 Your Highness's most obedient and
 loyal subject
 (Sd.) SEDIQUE HOSSEIN KHAN.

PART I.

SEC. II.—*My defence with regard to the composition of Mujmia-Khutub which is alleged to be seditious.*

MUJMIA KHUTAB OR MAIZAT-I-HOSNA—a collection of *Khutbas* read throughout the year. This book was published at Bhopal, in 1296 A. H. Rabiul-aul. It consisted of 252 pages, out of which 245 pages dealt with the *Khutbas*, written by the Mahommedan Theologues and Doctors. The maxims were compiled by Syed Mahommed, son of Ahmed, son of Abdool Bary, resident of Zubaide in Yemen, from the works published by Hafiz Ibnul Zonji and others. The above *Khutbas* were published with others which were in manuscripts, and among the latter was the *Khutba* on *Jehad*, compiled by Moulovie Ismail of Delhi. Moulovie Ismail was not the author of the original texts, which are to be found in the *Koran* and other religious books. The Moulovie speaks of *Jehad*, as taken from the religious books but does not incite the people to wage war against the Government.

1. The *Khutba* in question was only compiled by me.

2. The *Khutba* in question was published by oversight along with the important *Khutbas*, dealing with *Kuruf* (Sun Eclipse), *Khusuf* (Moon Eclipse), *Istaskai* (Rain), *Nika* (marriage) &c.

3. The *Khutba* in question, as a matter of practice, is not read on Fridays, in fact it is not read at all.

4. Nothing is written therein against the Government.

5. The author of the Khutba on Jehad never waged war against the government, nor did incite any person to wage such war. Syed Ahmed, in his reply to Dr. Hunter, wrote that the Khutba in question was meant against the Sikhs and not against the Government.

6. The maxims on Jehad are to be found in all religious books, especially the Koran, which has been translated into the Urdu, Persian, English, Turkish, and Pushta languages. These religious books are read by males and females, young or old. But did any body ever think of carrying on Jehad against the Government ? The Khutba in question was meant to prepare the Mahomedans to fight with the Sikhs. It was written in the Arabic language of which the generality of the people are ignorant.

7. The Koran and the six Hadis, called *Sihah-Satta*, treat of Jehad but no objection was ever taken to their publication. The Khutba in question is quite insignificant in comparison with them.

8. The year in which the Khutba in question was published did not witness any war. The Cabul war broke out a year after, but the causes of this war, can hardly be assigned to the publication of the Khutba.

9. The books, of this kind, have been published at Calcutta and Bombay, without any objection by the followers of the Hanifa Sect, who are not called

Wahabees. The Koran, which dwells forcibly on Jehad, was published in Hindee, at Calcutta, in the name of *Muoji Koran*. The *Miskad* was translated into the Persian language by Shaik Abdool Huq., and was published by him at Calcutta. The book on Jehad was published in the Persian and Arabic languages and its translations were published at Bombay. The *SHERA BEKIN* has been translated into Urdu and published. The *DAR MOOKTEAR* has also been translated into Urdu and published. The *FUTWA ALUMGHIR* has been published at Calcutta. Each and every one of the said books deals with the Jehad, but the *Khutba* in question contains a mention of it.

10. Under the benign and liberal British Government, the liberty of religion has been accorded to every one, high or low, without any discrimination. This has been repeatedly declared by the proclamations issued in the name of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress. At the Delhi Durbar on the 1st January 1877, the Viceroy declared "Now under laws which impartially protect all races and all creeds, every subject of Her Majesty may peacefully enjoy his own. The toleration of the Government permits each member of the community to follow without molestation the rules and rites of his religion." Again—"All men, high and low, may feel that under our Rule, they will enjoy liberty, equity and justice and that to promote their happiness, to add to their prosperity and advance their welfare are the everpresent aims and objects of our Empire."

The compilation of the religious books is one of

the rules and rites of religion which one is bound to observe. The Christians, Hindus, and Mahomedans publish their respective tenets and compile their religious maxims for publication. Each sect attacks the creed of another and the religious controversy is carried on verbally and in writings. The above publications have never been condemned by the enlightened Government. Seditious writings form no doubt an exception but they are quite distinct from religious writings.

11. Bhopal is not the seat of religious controversy. Even in the dark days of the Mutiny, the mutineers, whether Mahomedans or Hindus, were handed over to the Political Agent for punishment. The foreigners, Arabs, Turks, Afghans and others, are, under the standing order of the State, not allowed to stay at Bhopal for more than three or four days, on the ground that they might be the enemies of the British Government and create disaffection in the State.

12. The officials as a class are old and tried servants. The new ones were selected from the officers and pensioners of the British Government. Not a single officer has ever been suspected to be a Wahabee.

13. In the Education Department the curriculum is on the lines adopted elsewhere. The book on Jihad is never read or taught.

14. This book should be read with other books compiled or composed by me. Four years anterior to the publication of the book in question, I compiled a

book called *Hidayat-ul-Sail*. At page 121, line 110 of this book, I have stated in clear and unambiguous language that we (the Mahomedans) are not bound by the sayings of Mahomed, son of Abdool Waheb of Nejdi, the founder of the Wahabee Sect and Moulovie Ismail the author of the Khutba in dispute. In another book called *Mawadul Obeid* published by me, in 1298 A. H., I have shewn that the maxims on *Jehad* do not apply to this country and that it is a sin of heinous type, to break the obligations and stipulations of the Treaty with the Paramount Power. The sins and iniquities, of waging war against the British Government, are discussed in this book from page 33 to page 43. In 1299 A. H. I published the *Taj-Mukullub* which deals with the Wahabees. This sect became extinct in Arabia in 1818 A. D., the year of the Treaty entered into by the Paramount Power with the Bhopal State. This book was written on the authorities of the English Historians whose objects and motives can never be impugned. In 1298 A. H. I published the *Razul Khasib* which deals with the mistaken notions and ideas of the worshippers of tomb, who out of spite and enmity call others as Wahabees, as they do not countenance the practice of worshipping the tombs. The repudiation of the Wahabee creed by me, in 1292 A. H., clearly refutes the charge of being a Wahabee—a charge brought against me six years after the publication of my book.

15. The books named *Tukbiyatul Imaum Nasibut-ul-Muslamin*, *Raha-Soorat Hidayat-ul-Momni* are called the books of the Wahabees and their authors are

designated Wahabees. As a matter of fact there is not a single passage in any book which preaches Jehad, or establishes the right of the Wahabees. On the other hand the *Hidayat-ul-Momni* is an exposition against the *Tajia* and clearly repudiates the name and profession of the Wahabees. It was compiled by my late father before 1250 A. H., and was published at Calcutta, Delhi, and other places. The authors of the above books were learned Doctors and used to preach in India, but the Government never adopted any measures against them. The sect of Wahabees arose in Nejd. The illiterate people call the authors of the Hadis as Wahabees, though the books are meant to refute some of their practices and rites and were written at a time, long anterior to the invention of the word Wahabee. If the followers of the Hadis are called Wahabees, all followers of Islam, Shea or Hanifa, will come under the category of Wahabee. It is obligatory on the Sheas to declare Jehad when Imam Mehdi appears, and as for the Hanifas their books of authority contemplate of Jehad. The Hadis lay down some strict conditions for declaring Jehad. There is nothing peculiar in the followers of the Hadis to call them by the nickname of Wahabee. On the other hand they condemn the Jehad on the ground that it cannot be justified until and unless the requirements and conditions are fulfilled, but the signs of the time do not long since give birth to such requirements and conditions. In no country the followers of the Hadis can declare Jehad in the absence of the requirements and conditions. The followers of Hanifa are not

called Wahabees, but among the Mahomedans they were the persons who declared Jehad and fought under its name in the days of the Mutiny.

16. The illiterate Mahomedans, who do not understand their own religious doctrines, become fanatics and desperate characters. Those who have rightly understood the Hadis, will not follow in the wake of the fanatics and the mutineers, and the British Government will have no cause of complaint against them. Such men do not advocate the cause of Jehad but expressly declare that the requirements and conditions, to justify it, are not forthcoming. The Mahomedans in Cabul are the followers of Hanifa and not Wahabees.

The above explanation was rendered to Col. Bannerman in 1881. The enemies of the State wanted to implicate me by carrying tales to General Daly just after the rupture between the late Nawob Kudsia Begum and the present Ruler, regarding the civil and criminal cases in the Deori State. General Daly took no steps and after his departure Sir Lepel Griffin conveyed the instructions of the Government to Col. Bannerman pointing out the propriety of not publishing books which are adverse to the Government in religious and political views. The *Mujmia Khutab* was collected and destroyed in the presence of Col. Bannerman in March 1881. Since then I took a solemn vow to prevent, to the best of my power, the publication of any such book by any person in Bhopal. I myself made it a point to vindicate the cause of the Government in my works such as *Mawadul-Obeid*, *Rowz-i-khutkhuisib* and others.

S. H.

PART I.

SEC. III.—Cl. (a) *The despatch of the telegram by Sir Lepel Griffin charging me for having connection with the false Mehdi at Soudan.*

In 1885 Sir Lepel Griffin came back from England. On the 18th August 1885, the Vakil was asked by the Political Agent to inform Her Highness, the contents of a telegram which he had received from Sir Lepel on the previous day. The telegram was to this purport—Inform the Nawob who had *fillaka*) connection with the Mehdi that his disciple and successor Abdoola was killed at Khartoum, on the 26th July 1885, in the battle. The Vakil was directed by the Begum to ask the Political Agent what documentary proofs he had, to implicate the Nawob in the affair of the Mehdi of Soudan. In reply Col. Kincaid said that the telegram was meant to convey an information. But when he was asked by the State to explain what the Resident meant by the word ILLAKA, he stated that the Nawob was fully aware of all the facts and circumstances of the Mehdi, and in fact he had written a book on the subject. It was pointed out to the Political Agent that the word ILLAKA would convey a meaning quite different from knowledge.

On the 20th August 1885, a letter was formally addressed to the Political Agent asking him to inform what he meant by ILLAKA as the word itself did not bear out the meaning which he had put. In

reply a perwanna was issued through the Vakil stating that the wording of the telegram did not mean *illaka*, but an information supplied to a man, who had taken a fancy to a subject; for example informations of historical facts or stars, are given to those who are fond of history or astronomy; the Nawob had written a book on Mehdi, hence the information of the death of the false Mehdi was given to him.

On the 24th August 1885, the Vakil was directed to speak to the Political Agent that he had been duly informed of the publication of the book, which was written to shew that the Mehdi of Soudan was a false pretender, that the ignorant and illiterate men should not take him to be the promised Mehdi, as his appearance at Soudan was not borne out by the religious books. It was again pointed out to the Political Agent that the word *illaka* meant connection, interest or concern, and not fancy or knowledge, according to the Lexicon. It was futher represented that the subjects of Bhopal had no concern with any person, save and except the British Government. The Political Agent wrote to say that he would inform the Resident of the above.

S. H.

PART I.

SEC. III.—*Cl. (b). The charge brought against me by Din Mahomed, a Mahomedan convert.*

In 1885, I had the misfortune to incur the displeasure of the officers at Sehore and Indore ; the state members were at logger-heads with me, I was deprived of my title and salute and a Government order had been issued prohibiting me strictly to interfere in state affairs. It was at this critical time a person was set up, I believe, by my enemies to annihilate me completely.

In Safar 1303 A. H., one Din Mahomed, a Mahomedan convert, sent a letter asking me to pay him Rs. 1000, and threatening me to betray my secrets. He alleged in the letter, that I had paid him Rs. 1,000 for going to Soudan and that I had agreed to pay him Rs. 1,000 on his return. My Agent Abdool Rahaman forwarded this letter with a petition to the Ruler, who ordered an inquiry and report. The result of the inquiry held by Muksood Aly, was that Din Mahomed was out of employ, and was instigated by others to send the threatening letter to extort money from me, though he was quite a stranger to me.

Some time after I read in a Benaras newspaper that Din Mahomed was a man of unscrupulous character, and that he was in the habit of robbing men of their money by foul means.

The petitions subsequently sent by Din Mahomed to the Ruler clearly shew that he was a tool in the hands of my sworn enemies and that he sincerely repented of his evil doings.

PART I.

SEC. III—Cl. (c) *The compilation of Iqtrab-us-Saya.*

I shall now dwell on the book referred to by the Political Agent. It is called *Iqtrab-us-Saya* and is an Urdu translation from the Arabic Book called *Ishtral Ashard-us-Saya*, compiled by Sayed Mahommed Burzunji of Medina. It consists of 225 pages. It was published at Agra, in the Mufid Am Press in 1301 A. H. The original Arabic book is famous for the treatment of Resurrection. A Persian translation of the book was published in India by Moulovie Rifi-udin of Delhi.

The religious books generally speak of the advent of the promised Mehdi at the universal destruction without assigning any date for it. It was on this account that many false Mehdis arose, and many saints made false prophecies about the appearance of the Mehdi.

The sole object of publishing the book is to convince my co-religionists to be on their guard, and not to recognise the false Mehdis, set up in the east and the west, by influential men AMIRS (wealthy), ALIM (learned), Reis (Ruler), Dervish (dervise), Soudagar (merchant), not unlike the one set up at Soudan. The traits in the character of the promised Mehdi, were described by Mahommed.

The publication of the book was quite opportune. It was quite in support of the Government and a complete refutation of the false claims of the Soudan man. I am afraid the Resident was misinformed by the

man who represented that the book was in support of the right of the Soudan man. I shall be very glad to court an inquiry on the subject.

In the book in question, I have discussed on the claims of the twenty persons who preceded the Mehdi of Soudan and excelled the latter in birth, learning and religious professions and practices. These men proclaimed themselves to be Mehdis but were subsequently found out to be imposters. How could the Soudan man be acknowledged as the true Mehdi? The following passage is clearly in point.

“To me the Mehdi of Soudan has caused the disturbances to wage war but his claims to Mehdiship are totally false. In Egypt he waged war and the British Government is trying to put down the disturbances.”

The claims of the false Mehdis are described at pages 12 to 121. At page 118, lines 13 and 14, the following sentences occur;

“No proofs are forthcoming to shew that the claimant at Soudan is the promised Mehdi who will appear at the general destruction. Where are the true traits in his character, and the signs of the time as described by Mahommed in the Hadis and his disciples in their sayings? Such claims were made by his predecessors but were proved false.”

At page 19 it is said,

“It is likely that this man may be a Mujuddid (Reformer) of the faith, though he is not so described in the newspapers.”

Vide page 19 line 11,

“ I know not this Majuddid of Soudan. He is not, I can confidently assert, the promised Mehdi.”

The conclusion drawn by me at page 121 runs thus;

“ The general public are disposed to follow the braying of an ass. Some follow hoodwinked those who claim to be God, Prophet, Mehdi, Majuddid (reformer), Mujtahed (Imam), and prophetic Saint. The result of such a state of things is that the people put confidence in such men and believe every flying gossip about them.”

According to my views such men are fools and those who follow them are no less. The pretensions of the Soudan man as Mehdi and reformer have been proved to be false. The book concludes with a Persian couplet which means;

Trust not the report circulated by man,
Look, how false is the pretender of Soudan.

I have stated in clear and unambiguous language that the promised Mehdi is yet to come, he will appear at Medina and not elsewhere, though he may be born in Turkey, Egypt, England or Soudan; he will not put forward his claim and will refuse to enlist disciples at Mecca. The year, in which he is ushered in, will witness the reappearance of Jesus Christ. Those, who believe in the appearance of the Mehdi, are bound to shew the reappearance of Jesus Christ. The Mahomedan Doctors and Theologues are not at one on the appearance of the Mehdi, but none entertains any doubt on the reappearance of Jesus. The promised Mehdi

will have his followers at places which lie between Roukan and Mecca. The death of Khalipha Abdoola, the successor of the deceased Mehdi of Soudan, at Khartoum, clearly disproves the claim, of the false Mehdi and supports my views. The above information was conveyed to me by the Resident, with reasons best known to him, but at any rate it confirms my views on the promised Mehdi.

S. H.

PART I.

SEC. IV.—Cl (a) *The remarks made by Sir Lepel on the books compiled and published by me forwarded to the State, by Col. Kincaid, with a (memorandum).*

YAD-DAST No. 96.

Dated the 31st. August 1885.

Bhopal.

FROM COL. KINCAID,

TO HER HIGHNESS THE BEGUM OF BHOPAL.

Under the instructions of the Resident for the Central India, a copy of his remarks on the books compiled and composed by the Nawob Wala Jah Amir-ul-Mulk Mahommed Sedique Hossein Khan Bahadoor, is sent to you; the translation of the remarks was read to you at an interview on the 28th August last.

Remarks by Sir Lepel Griffin.

In the discharge of my duties as Agent to the Governor General for the Central India, I read out to Her Highness the Begum and her husband the orders of the Government, on the seditious writings compiled, published, and circulated by the Nabob.

The name of the compilation is *Dewan-ul-khutab-ala-Sanatul Kamala*. It is a collection of benedictions

read out every Friday throughout the year. This has been written in the Arabic language of which the generality of men in India are ignorant. The apparent object of the compiler is to give publicity to it in Arabia and Egypt. The Government of India conveyed its high displeasure to the Nawob through the Political Agent, for the seditious tone and spirit of the writings ; but in consideration of the loyal and friendly disposition of the Begum, the Nawob was directed to collect all the copies, which had been disposed of, by sale or otherwise, and was moreover warned not to compile such books. No more action was taken against him at that time.

On the 21st March 1881, Col. Bannerman reported to me, that the Nawob had carried out the orders of the Government, and that he was informed of the fact that the Government did not severely deal with him in consideration of the claims of the Begum. The Begum expressed her ignorance of the publication of the *Khutab* objected to, and was grateful to the Government for the kind consideration shewn to her husband.

The question is how far the Nawob has carried out the orders of the Government and acted up to the censure passed on him.

The first book which I would mention is called the GAIRBAL, the History of Bhopal, written in 1882, a year after the censure. A copy of the book was received by me in the season of the *Khareef* harvest. The book was read out to me by a respectable and well-read Musulman, in the service of the Government. The book, I think, is open

to censure in the highest degree. I sent a private letter to the Political Agent, intimating my visit to Bhopal within a short time, and asking him to read the book carefully and find out the objectionable passages therein, other than those marked by me. I wrote further to say that on my arrival at Bhopal I would consider the case of the Nawob and discuss with him in the presence of the Begum regarding the objectionable passages. This was written on the 2nd December 1882. My visit to Bhopal was deferred on account of the disturbances of the Bhil insurgents. I had to proceed to Malwa postponing my visit. A few days after I went to England. The inquiry thus stood over till this day. It is proper to state here, that I asked the Political Agent to send for four copies of the book, but the State refused to give, on the ground that the book, was incomplete and unpublished. I was somehow supplied with a copy of the book, four months previous to the reply given by the State, which was not true. The circulation of the book was stopped for my interference in the matter. The books were not destroyed; the copies published are in possession of the Nawob. I need not argue on it in detail, as the book has not been circulated but I must say that there are some passages in it which are open to grave objections. The pages which deal with the marriage of the Sultan Jehan, the heir-apparent, and the trip of the Begum to Calcutta in 1882, were written with the object of exciting the wrath of the Begum against her daughter and son-in-law, who have been treated very unjustly, and whose

loyalty has been called in question in a bad spirit. The right of the heir-apparent, who is represented to belong not to the royal family, is questioned ; and the right of Alumghir Mahomed is supported. The step-sons of the Begum, who are not on good terms with the Nawob, are represented to be wicked and disloyal. The political Agent and the Resident are described in false colours, to convince the Begum that they are hostile to her and partial to her daughter and son-in-law, and it has been falsely represented that the Resident advised the Begum to appoint her son-in-law as the minister.

The work will be hereafter criticised carefully, but it is worth noting here, that I know, for certain, that the writings are meant to create a rupture in the family of the Begum. The State members have been falsely described with the object of defaming them. Since the day of my appointment at Indore, I have had every opportunity to watch their conduct. The conduct of the officers of the Central India has been also wrongly described out of malice.

There is another book which deserves noticing. It is called *Turjama Wahabea* and published in 1884 in the Urdu language. This book was translated into English by Syed Akbar Alim, of late, the third assistant to the second minister. The preface is an encomium on the talents of the Nawob, and was composed by the Nawob himself against the wishes of the Translator, who gave me the information. I do not intend arguing on the book, as the Translation cannot convey exactly the true ideas and sentiments,

as embodied in the original book, which a well-read Musulman can easily catch at a hint. But considering the rank of the Nawob and the existing circumstances of the day, apart from the tendency of the book to incite disturbance, I should say that the extolling of the Wahabee creed and arguing in support thereof is a breach of the friendship which exists with the British government, especially at a time when it was involved in Egypt in the war with the Medhi. Such a conduct, on the part of one who is the husband of a leading chief in India, was quite unwaranted. The tendency of the Nawob to the Wahabee creed is well-known; he never misses any opportunity to praise the Wahabees in his work. With whatever object the book in question was compiled, he encouraged the Wahabee creed in the *Gairbal*, at the beginning and conclusion of it, and often asserted that the Indian Wahabees are true, faithful and peace-abiding.

The best way, to understand the object and context of the *Turjama Wahabea*, is to refer to the *Iktrab Saya* which was complied in April 1884 and published in 1885, in the name of his eldest son Noorul Hossein. I can not make out the object of publishing the book in the name of his son; especially when the latter does not profess a creed which the book purports to support. The object might be to ward off an inquiry. The book was published at Agra and not at Bhopal, to impose upon the Mussulmans who are ignorant of the tone and style of the Nawob's writings; but the educated men are of opinion that the *Iktrab Saya* is a

seditionous book, especially directed against the English. The criticisms on the book are given in detail.

At the outset, I would state that the remarks made on the Translation of *Wahabea* apply to this book. Even conceding that the book is not seditious, the publication of it is a flagrant breach of the friendship with the British Government, looking at the existing circumstances of the day, the difficulties with which the British are beset at Soudan and the fact of the publisher being the husband of a loyal Ruler. The book generally speaks of the claims and right of the Mehdi, and especially of the Mehdi of Soudan. The object of the Nawob is to shew, (1) that the time of the advent of the promised Mehdi is drawing nigh ; (2) that every man who achieves some glorious deeds is a Mehdi.

Moreover the Mahomedans are alleged to be wanting, now a days, in martial spirit since they have ceased to carry on Jehad. The Nawob has very stirringly written the book to infuse spirit in the minds of the Mahomedans in favor of the Mehdi. He has expressed his hearty wishes and hopes for the advent of the promised Mehdi, as the time has arrived to kill the infidel (Firringees) and achieve victory. In support of this the Nawob has tried to shew that the present time is the same as prophesied in the *Hadis*, wherein it is described that the sins and evils in this world will spread far and wide. He indirectly suggests that the Rulers of India i. e. the Empress and the Viceroy and the English should be brought before the Mehdi with fetters of sub-

jection. The Mehdi of Soudan has been compared with Abdool Wahab of Nejdi to excite the Indian Wahabeees. He has tried to shew that the English newspapers write falsely in fear of the Government. In short those who read the book will understand that the fall of Mehdi is false. The victory of the Mehdi and the defeat of the English army are described in glowing terms. The Nawab attempts to shew that the *Hadis*, which describe the signs of the advent of the Mehdi, are not trustworthy, with the object of shewing that the Mehdi of Soudan, though wanting in the attributes as described in the Hadis, is a true prophet. The Nawab states, that in every century a reformer rises, spreads the religion by Jehad and purifies it of all concomitant evils; his object is to prepare the Mahomedans for Jehad and to recognise the Soudan-man as a reformer, if not as the promised Mehdi. The Nawab has attempted to conceal his real object by accusing the Soudan man, here and there, without assigning any reason, except that the promised Mehdi comes from the Syed family. Thus the Indian Mahomedans will recognise the Mehdi of Soudan as the promised Mehdi, if he is proved to be a Syed. In proof of the above I would cite the following pages.

p. p. 5 and 6 from the beginning to the end.

p. 6 lines 11, 19 and 20

p. 37 do 9

p. 41 do 20

p. 57 do 1

p. 58 do 11, 12 & 13

p. 59	lines	9
p. 64	do	13
p. 57	do	8
p. 116	do	13
p. 120	do	15
p. 220	do	17
p. 221	do	8 & 4
p. 140		
p. 141	do	3

The last book to which I would allude is the *Hidayut Sail Ala Hidayut-ul-Masail*, written in the Persian language. I think it clearly incites the Mussalmans in India against the British Government. This is more seditious for the language than the Arabic books, for which the Nabob incurred the displeasure of the Government in 1881. The books, for which pardon was granted to him in that year, could not and did not include this book in question which was published a year before. The Nawob committed more serious offences in publishing this book than what he did in publishing the book which called for censure, and for which he was eventually pardoned by the Government. In 1881, the Government was not aware of the publication and contents of this book. The book is intelligible to every sensible man and hence no comments are called for. I would cite the following pages for easy references, which have been translated for me by an able man. This book was written at the time of the arrival of the Prince of Wales in India. The following pages are cited.

Question 32. Answer page 94 Lines 16 to 24
 page 95 Lines 17 to 24
 page 96 Lines 3 to 4
 and from 26 to the conclusion.

Question 33, page 97 Lines 2 and 4.

Answer page 97 Lines 4 and 13 and 19 and 20.

Question 34. page 98 Lines 8 and 11.

Answer page 98 Line 18 to the conclusion.

Question 35. page 100 Lines 5 and 17.

Question 36. page 101 Lines 4, 10 and 11.

Question 39. page 103 Lines 2 and 5.

Query No. 30 page 88 Line 1.

Is it not proper to allow the *Kaffirs* (infidels) to live in Arabia?

Answer, page 88 line 2.

The infidels are of three classes.

- (1) Those who profess a creed, contrary to the established one, are not allowed to live in Arabia until they embrace Mahommedanism, otherwise they should be killed.
- (2) The Hebrews and the Nazarenes deserve death or are liable to pay *jezia*, under the orders of God, but the *Hadis* enjoin on their expulsion from Arabia.

At page 88 lines 10 and 11 the following sentence occurs. The *Hadis* say "expel the Hebrews and the Nazarenes from Arabia" Page 91 Line 2 and 4.

- (3) The Mosaics who are grain-dealers, and the *Kaffirs* of Iran *i.e.* the men who have not got the inspired books, are not mentioned in the *Hadis*

except that of Abdool Rahaman Bin Wuf in which it is advised to accord them the same treatment, which others who have got the inspired books receive, or in other words the expulsion of them from Arabia is enjoined. Page 91 line 13 to 18.

Those who have got the inspired books and the *Kaffirs* of Iran living in Yedda, and especially in the seaports near Mecca, have lately raised disturbances. This is known to the residents and the Hajis; but it seems that Sultan Abdool Aziz Khan expelled the Firingee preachers from Arabia and wrested their flags from Yedda. The action of the Sultan was based on political motives and not for carrying out the religious commandments. Still the action is in accordance with the order of God and his Prophet.

Question 32. What is the order for a Mussalman, who for trade goes to a Mahammedan country, under the subjection and control of the English, and accepts their laws though they may be against the Shera and lives permanently and acquires there influence ?

At page 94 lines 16 & 24.

This question has many aspects..

First. In *Thafatul Mirioj*, Ibun Hujfir Mecci has called a Mahomedan city under the subjection of the *kaffirs*, Dar-ul Harb *i. e.*, the place where the Jehad can be declared. The Prophet has said that Islam is conqueror and not conquered. God is the

absolute owner of the world; He giveth one as he chooseth—such are His commandments. It is the duty of the Mahomedans to take back a place which formerly belonged to them from the *kaffirs* by means of war or otherwise.

Second: The Mahomedans who emigrate to such places are great sinners though they may not accept the laws of the *Kaffirs*. The Mahomedans who recognise the laws of the *kaffirs* are themselves *kaffirs* and liable to the punishment meted out to the dissenters.

Page 95 from line 17 to line 24.

Third: It is a heinous offence to live permanently at such places and carry on trade there. They presumably accept the acts of the *kaffirs*. According to *Shera* they should fight with the *Kaffirs*, but it devolves on their neighbours who live at a distance of three *manjils* to render them help. It is the duty of the residents of such towns and their neighbours to fight with the *kaffirs* and to free their co-religionists by means of war under the commands of God which run thus:—"Kill the *kaffirs* wherever you find them; catch and surround them." Thus much more it becomes the duty of such Mahomedans to expel the *kaffirs* who have conquered our cities and levelled our houses and insulted us.

Page 96. Lines 3 and 4.

According to the *Koran*, the agents and friends of the *kaffirs* are irreligious. The *Koran* says—"Thou shalt not attain thy religion which believes in God and future world, if thou art a friend to those who are

enemies of God, be they thy relatives, nay thy father.” God says “Thou shalt not make friends with those who are my enemies or who refuse to accept the truths which are revealed to thee.” God further enjoins—“Thou shalt not be a friend of one, who laughs at thy religion—even if he has got the inspired book before or one who does not believe in me. If thou professest to be true fear me..” The kaffir Firringees are the Kaffirs of the first-water. Regarding a person who sells his house to a Nazarene to enable the latter to build there church, Ibz Shersen quotes the text of the Koran, which runs thus—“Any Mahomedan who contracts friendship with the Nazarene becomes a Nazarene.”

Page 96. Line 26. The Nazarenes want to conquer us, their words breathe enmity, and their hearts overflow with it. As God has enjoined, in the *Koran*, on the Mahomedans to live apart from them, so it is not proper to respect them.

Question 33. Page 97.

Is a Mussalman faithful to his creed who lives in a place under the subjection of the Kaffirs and obeys their orders ?

In illustration of the fact that they are subjects of the Kaffirs the flags of Britannia and others are alluded to.

Answer. Page 96. Such Mussalmans are the friends to the *Kaffirs* and attached to them to whom they owe their position and dignity. These Kaffirs enjoy their prosperity in this world only, and have

imposed on the Mussalmans. Hence the Mussalmans are anxious to attain property, land and wealth, but are indifferent to the future world. They think that the blessings of the British Government in regard to the safety of their life and property are of importance. Such illiterate Islamites, who are indifferent to the religion of the Kaffirs, are guilty of heinous sins and liable to punishment under *Shera*. Those, who are well-conversant with the doctrines of the religion, and respect the Nazarenes, should cease to do, otherwise they would be dissenters and liable to punishment inflicted on the dissenters. Such men are irreligious according to the *Futwas* of the *Hadis* and the *Koran*. God has strictly forbidden to make friends with the Kaffirs—hence it follows that these men are irreligious.

Question 34. Page 98.

What will be the fate of those Mussalmans who consider the Kaffirs to be judges and dispensers of justice ? The names of the Mahomedan Sultans are referred to strongly.

Answer :—Those who praise the Kaffirs are Kaffirs themselves and liable to punishment for the sins of heinous type. They should be avoided. But they are not Kaffirs who praise the personal merits of the Kaffirs and not their religion.

Page 98.

Those who praise the Kaffirs, their laws and precepts which are wicked, are Kaffirs themselves. They are declared sinners by God.

Some of these laws apparently seem to be just, but in reality they have been perverted by these wicked Kaffirs to evil purposes and seem to threaten Islamism. In fact there is no just law except the *Sheras* which are based on the *Koran* and the *Hadis*. The commands of God are just; if the laws of the Kaffirs had been just they would have been respected. But the Mahomedans have been enjoined to condemn the religion of the Nazarenes and others. If their laws had been just their religion could not have been condemned. The just laws can not be condemned. The creed of the Mahomedans is the true religion and the Kaffirs have no religion; it is improper to call their laws just.

Question 35 page 100.

A Mahomedan, in spite of prohibition, goes to the territory of the Kaffirs with property and is killed on his way; what is the law on the death and property of such a man? Is it proper to destroy his property as he had the intention to be domiciled in the land of the Kaffirs and the murderer belongs to the class of men who intend destroying the land of the Kaffirs? Is he a martyr? What is the law which governs the murderer?

Answer :—The land of the Kaffirs consists of (I) the country which is their mother-land and has been in their possession; to wit, Sham and Irak which were under the subjection of the Kaffirs at the time of the Prophet. It is no doubt proper

under the *Shera* to carry on trade at such places—as a means of livelihood. The disciples of Mahomed, who were contemporaneous with him, used to resort to such places for trade, in short the Prophet himself on behalf of his first wife used to go on trading business. It is not prohibited to resort to such places on business. Those who kill such persons should be dealt with as plunderers ; the death of such plunderers is justified and those unfortunate victims are martyrs under the Hadis.

(2) The country which was under the possession of the Mahammedans but subsequently conquered by the Kaffirs, should be taken back by means of *Jehad*. Those who go to such places on trading purposes are sinners in the eye of God and religion.

Question 26. Page 100. Line 3 & Page 101 Lines 4 to 11.

Is it proper under the *Shera* for a man to go with his family and property and be domiciled in a Mahomedan country which has been conquered by the Kaffirs ? Is he guilty of a sin ? Is the religion of a man untainted, if he considers the Kaffirs his enemies but lives in their country for the sake of urgent necessity ? Is he bound to accept and obey the laws of the Kaffirs which conflict with the *Shera* ? Should he live there or leave the place ?

Answer:—It is proper for a Mahomedan, who doubts the conflicting religion of the Kaffirs and cannot perform his own religious rites, to leave a Mahom-

medan country under the Kaffirs, otherwise he is a sinner. Even if he performs his religious rites safely there, he should leave it for a Mahommedan country, to prevent the increase of population in the land of the Kaffirs and to avoid their frauds and imposition.

Question 39. Page 103. Lines 2 to 5.

Two Mahomedans ask for justice from a *Kazi* but one subsequently asks trial from a *Kaffir* judge on the grouud that he is his subject. Is it proper to confiscate his property and is he a heretic?

Answer:—If he doubts in the *Shera* and believes in the propriety of the English laws, he must be deemed guilty of heresy and should be killed. But if he does not disregard the *Shera*, he is to receive a different punishment.

PART I.

SEC IV—Cl. (b) *The explanation in detail submitted to the Ruler.*

In August 1885, Sir Lepel came to Bhopal and had an interview with the Ruler on the 27th of that month. In the course of the conversation he spoke ill of me in no measured terms, but it is not proper to state here the whole conversation ; I will confine to those points only which require an explanation. An explanation was called for by Col. Kincaid in his memorandum, dated the 31st August 1885, to the objections set forth in the letter of Sir Lepel, dated the 26th August 1885. A true copy of the explanation is given elsewhere but an amplification of it is given below.

First objection to the Dewan Khutab.

“The apparent object of publishing the Dewan Khutab is to give publicity to it in Egypt and Arabia.”

Explanation.—The Resident states that the Dewan Khutab is a collection of benedictions read every Friday throughout the year. The book published in Egypt does not include the Khutba of Ismail and is not read out on every Friday. All the copies which included the Khutba of Ismail and published here, were collected and destroyed before Col. Bannerman. After the censure passed on me by the Government I did not compose or translate any book which might be deemed hostile to the Government. The MOADUL

OBEID, the RAZ KHASIB, and others were composed by me, the TURJAMAN WAHABEA and the IQTRAB-US-SAYA were translated by me. They deal with Jihad, in general, the impropriety of declaring it in India, and the breach of agreement entered into with the British Government. They are clearly in support of the Government and in direct refutation of the doctrines of the Wahabees. The book published in Egypt may be examined for the satisfaction of the Resident who is anxious to see how far I have carried out the orders of the Government. I have placed India in the category of Dar-ul-Islam (Place of safety) to check the sedition-mongers and fanatics.

Second objection to the GAIRBAL.

“The GAIRBAL or the History of Bhopal, in the passages dealing with the marriage of the daughter of the Begum and her trip to Calcutta in 1882, shews that the writer has the object to excite the displeasure of the Ruler towards her daughter and son-in-law. The daughter, who is alleged indirectly to be a descendant not of the Royal Family, has a right inferior to that of Alumghir Mahommed Khan, who may eventually succeed to the throne.”

*Explanation :—*There is a history of Bhopal which was translated by Mr. Barstow; but this is incomplete. It was the intention of the Ruler to complete the new history in three or four parts by including the subsequent events of Bhopal. One part was ready for publication but a copy was stolen from the press and sent to the Resident, who refused to give out the name of the thief, though the state asked

for it in right earnest. The title page of this part bore the seal and signature of the Ruler and notwithstanding this, the Resident has come down on me.

The narration of the trip to Calcutta is taken from the office records, and if history is meant to conceal the true facts, the "GAIRBAL" is undoubtedly open to objection. It is alleged that the object of the book was to excite the ill-feelings of the Ruler towards her daughter. But was the Sultan Jehan in good odours with her mother before the compilation of the book ? For some time before the collection of the facts entered in the "GAIRBAL," the mother and daughter were on bad terms with each other. The Resident may well remember that the Begum strongly protested against the private visits which he paid to her daughter. Was it not notoriously known in Bhopal that the daughter and son-in-law were hostile to the Ruler ? But after all the Sultan Jehan is a daughter and the Ruler is a mother. The feelings of a mother are quite unique. She must feel for her daughter, her actions may be misunderstood or misconstrued by others, but nature will eventually prevail on her ; she may be actuated by the best motives to train her daughter to obedience and loyalty. The Ruler brought up Beelkis, the eldest daughter of the Sultan Jehan, and granted her a Jaiger of Rs. 20,000. This very fact speaks volumes against the story that the Begum is highly offended with her daughter. Those who give out this story do not exactly imagine the position of a mother who wants to bring round her disobedient child.

As a matter of fact I tried to the best of my power to make up the family differences. I interceded in behalf of the daughter on more than one occasion but I failed. I requested the Ruler to give a post to her son-in-law, but she was against the proposal. I believe the Resident might have read the passage which contains my recommendation.

Alumghir Mahommed Khan is not my relative or friend. Even supposing for the sake of argument, that I have an intention to see that he succeeds to the throne, is there any chance of carrying it into execution? In the very face of it the idea is preposterous and I can hardly gain any thing thereby. I am in Bhopal for upwards of thirty-two years. I am fully aware of the conditions imposed on the State by the Paramount Power. Any attempt to disinherit the Sultan Jehan is foolish and absurd.

In continuation of this charge Sir Lepel observes that the step-sons of the Begum are not friendly to me and hence they are stated to be notorious characters and hostile to the State.

I have reasons to believe that the two step-sons of the Begum gave out some time ago, that I had broken down the gate in their garden but it was totally unfounded. The *perwana* of Col. Kincaid, dated the 23rd March 1882, is to the following effect—"A part of the garden will necessarily fall within the Railway Lines, the owners of the garden should be ordered by the Begum not to interfere with the Railway work."

This garden was gifted away to the Sultan Jehan by

the late Omrao Dullah. Acting under my advice the Begum gave the garden to her two step-sons. These young men incurred the displeasure of the Begum for acts of oppression and their Jaiger was confiscated. On my recommendation a money allowance was assigned to them.. Such was the conduct which I shewed to them. But the question whether they are notorious characters and hostile to the State, is one which the Ruler alone can answer,

Sir Lepel observes "The Begum was induced to believe that it was the intention of the Resident to appoint the son-in-law as the minister of the State whereas it is wholly false."

It is assumed that the Begum, who has hitherto commanded the respect and admiration of the high authorities, is not alive to her own interest and that in lieu of gratitude for the favors shewn to me, I intend to put my wife and benefactress in scrape by creating a rupture between her and the Agent to the Governor-General.

The fact of the recommendation of the son-in-law for the post of the minister by the Resident will appear from the correspondence which passed on the subject. I would respectfully invite the attention of the Resident to his letters, dated the 4th February, and the 4th March 1882, and the replies thereto of the Begum. The incidental mention of the fact has bearing on the agreement of the son-in-law and his subsequent conduct, but it was not meant to disparage the Resident.

Sir Lepel further observes—"This has been en-

tered in the history with the object of creating dissensions in the family of the Begum."

I would call upon the Begum, her daughter and son-in-law to state whether in the course of my life I adopted any step to create dissensions. As a matter of fact I treated the Sultan Jehan as a daughter, fondled her children and always espoused her cause to appease the wrath of the Ruler. What earthly benefit could I reap ? It was given out by the Sultan Jehan and her husband that I had in contemplation of marrying my son Aly Hossein Khan with Beelkis. Aly Hossein is a father of several children and Bellkis has not attained her marriageable age. I executed a will, ten years ago, strictly forbidding my sons to marry in an affluent and non-Syed family. The result of such connection is the cause of vexations and annoyances. There is a dispute between the mother and the daughter, hence, the marriage of the grand-daughter especially with my son is out of the question.

Sir Lepel again remarks—"Regarding the separate branches of the Royal Dynasty, false statements have been made to disgrace them."

The whole dispute hinges on the phrase FALSE STATEMENT. It has not been shewn by the Resident that a particular statement is false. In the absence of such an allegation the charge shall remain unanswered. The Ruler under whose authority and control the facts and events were collated will be the best person to meet the challenge of an accuser. History deals with stern facts, however unpalatable

they may be. Baber in his autobiography or history described the defects in his own character and his own reverses and humiliations. The AJABUL MUKDAR speaks in disparaging terms of Timoor. Abdool Quadir of Bedoin wrote a history of Akbar condemning him and his acts. Similarly the history of Alumghir by Niamut Khan Aly is full of sharp criticisms. Syed Ahmed Khan, in describing the Sepoy Revolt, has assigned the cause of it to the conduct of the English officers. The GATRBAL is a history and if it teems with stern facts it is not open to any censure.

The Resident observes—"As the book has not yet been circulated I need not argue on it."

This is an admission of a fact that the book is not accessible to the public and if there are passages, open to objection, they will not harm any body. But it is passing strange how the book found its way to Indore. The book must have been stolen and justice should be allowed to overtake the thief. I believe that Sir Lepel is not willing to give out the name of the thief, for reasons best known to him but incomprehensible to me.

In conclusion I would invite the attention of the Resident to the fact that the presumptions are always in favor of the accused, unless the contrary is shewn. No proof has been given to shew the falsity of any fact stated in the GATRBAL, and as such I claim the benefit of the presumptions regarding the charges brought by him on the false representation of my enemies.

Third Objection.

“*The Tarjaman Wahabea* published in 1884 was translated by Akbar Alim and the preface to it was composed by the Nawab and inserted therein against the will of the Translator. The preface is full of panegyrics on the Nawab.”

The above charge is based upon the statement of the translator, but the statement was made *ex parte*, and as such it should be accepted with the greatest caution. The preface is written in English and I am quite ignorant of this language. If the preface was written in Urdu, the Resident will be good enough to call upon the translator to produce the original draft. As a matter of fact, the translator informed me of the contents of the preface written by him, and I asked him to score out the passage which was meant an eulogy on me. I received reliable information, that the translator was set up by Ahmed Reza, the late minister of the State, who was dismissed from service, to make a false statement. The information was given to me by Sanjar Poet and his letter was forwarded to Col. Kincaid for perusal, but was never returned. Poor Sanjar incurred the displeasure of the *Politicals* and was turned out by the Resident, and Ahmed Reza was provided with a post under the Nizam on the recommendation of Sir Lepel.

It is alleged by Sir Lepel that Akbar Alim, the translator, stated that the publication of the book in question, especially at a time when the false Mehdi

was set up, is a breach of the friendship with the British Government.

The view taken by Akbar Alim is not correct. The book is a history of the Wahabee creed and is based upon the Christian authorities. It is meant to strengthen the relation which exists between the British Government and the Indian Mahomedans. The book was presented to Lord Ripon whose Private Secretary sent the following letter, dated the 28th December 1884, to the Begum.

“According to the wishes of Lord Ripon, I convey many thanks to you for the translation of the book of the Wahabees which was compiled by the Nawob consort &c.”

On the occasion of the opening of the Bhopal State Railway, a Durbar was held and thirteen copies were presented to the European officers. Would any man have the hardihood to do it, fully conscious of the fact that the books would bring ruin on him?

I have received letters from distinguished officers stating that the Government should be thankful to me for the publication of the book.

Sir Lepel observes—“With whatever object the book was published, Wahabeeism has been encouraged in the beginning and conclusion of the GAIRBAL.”

The Resident has not cited the passages on which the charge is founded. But I would invite his attention to the pages numbered three to eight. These pages and my conclusion totally refute the Wahabee creed and do not lend any support to it. The Editor of the Indian Chronicle, in its issue of the 6th April

1885, paid high compliments to the author of the TURJAMAN WAHABEA. The Editor is, I believe, a Christian and an Englishman.

The presentation of the book to the distinguished Englishmen and the complimentary remarks of an English Editor tend to shew that the publication of the book was made with an object other than what was represented to, and believed by, Sir Lepel.

Fourth Objection.

“The IQTRAB-US-SAYA was compiled by the Nawab in April 1884 and published in 1885 in the name of his son. The book is especially directed against the British Government.”

Explanation.—The book in question is written in Urdu and not in Arabic language and is not incomprehensible to the generality of men. This is a translation from the Arabic book ISHA-UL-ASHRAT-US-SAYA, which in general parlance goes by the name of KAYAMUTNAMEH (Book of Resurrection), like the KAYAMATNAMEH by Moulovie Rufi-u-din of Delhi in the Persian language, which has also been translated into Urdu. Like other religious books on Islam it speaks *inter alia* of the appearance of Mehdi and the ascension of Messiah to heaven as the signs of the resurrection. No date, month or year has been fixed for it. The circumstances for the appearance of the promised Mehdi are written in the HADIS and all KYAMUTNAMEH books; they have been published from a long time. The book in question contains nothing new. Every author quotes in his book from other religious books,—this is no offence in the eye of law or

religion. According to the religion of the Christians, the advent of Messiah is expected. The Sheas expect the appearance of the Mehdi, who is concealed somewhere in Serdabah Samra, though they do not specify the time. The Hindoos are in expectation of an Avatar, the Hebrews of Dujjal and the Mahommedans of Mehdi and Messiah. This is in no way inimical to the interests of the British Government. In this book the claim of the Soudan man has been written and the signs of the appearance of the promised Mehdi are described. This is rather in support of the Government. In the Arabic language there are many *Kayamutnamahs* which mention of the Mehdi e. g. *TUZ-KERA KURTABI KITAB-A-SAYA*. These books especially treat of the subject. The *SIMON ARBA* and other theological books speak generally of the signs of the appearance of the promised Mehdi. These books have been published several times in India and Arabia. The contents of these books have been translated by me without any comment. On the other hand I have shewn that the claimant of Soudan is not the promised Mehdi as he is wanting in the traits which the true Mehdi is supposed to possess. All claimants who appeared before were false pretenders. The book in question is not the only book in which the promised Mehdi is treated but there are many books on the subject e. g. (1) *Ekdul-darafi-abul-wul Mortaji* by YEUF TRI AHIA; (2) *Urf urdi Fil Akberul Mehdi* by JALALUDIN SEOTI; (3) *Quool Mooktosir Filalul Montagir* by IBN HEIJER MUKKI, (4) *Musrab Urdi Fimazabul-Mehdi* by

ALIKARY HANIFI, (5) *Burhan Fiahwal Mehdi Akherzama* by ALY MIRTAKI HANIFA, (6) *Towji Fi Tawatir Majai Fil Montagir-u-Dijjal* by ULMASI, (7) *Kalam Majdi Fizulurul Mehdi*, (8) *Tarikh Ibnul Khalgoon* and others.

These books and treatises are available in India but no book or treatise speaks of the appearance of Mehdi at Soudan or in Egypt or in Turkistan. This is not even so mentioned by the Sheas, but on the other hand the promised Mehdi will pass through Medina and appear at Mecca. This also has been established in the IQTRAB SAYA, to remove any doubts of those who may think, at the inducement of others or at the writings in the newspapers, that the claimant at Soudan is the true Mehdi, the book in question is meant to repudiate not only the claim of the pretender at Soudan but to expressly disaffirm of his being a reformer. The question which calls for solution is whether the book in dispute is in support of, or in opposition to, the Government. The book is a true exposition of the Mahomedan creed without any fulsome adulation of the Government. All treatises on the promised Mehdi are on the lines adopted by me in this book *i. e.*, on the religious maxims which shall remain unaltered. If the claimant at Soudan is the true Mehdi where is the Messiah whose advent is simultaneous with the appearance of the Mehdi, as affirmed in the Mahomedan creed and the religious treatises and clearly shewn in the Iqtrab Saya ? The opportune production of the book should be looked upon by the Government with favor as it

deserves. The book in question shews that the date for the appearance of the promised Mehdi prophesied by the inspired Mahomedan Doctors has been proved untrue. None can speak of the date of his appearance. This fact was established in the HAJJUL KERAMA long before the publication of the book in question. Thus how can I recognise the pretenders like that of the Soudan-man unless they possess traits in their character described by me in the IQTRAB SAYA and borrowed from the HADIS? Thousands of Mehdis may arise but I shall take them to be false pretenders. The book in question is in support of, and not in opposition to, the Government. I think that Sir Lepel has understood the object of the book though he has taken objection to it as will appear from his writing. He says—

“Even supposing that the object of the book is not to create disturbances, the publication of such a book is a breach of the friendship existing with the Government.”

Explanation. How can the book, which forcibly refutes the claim of the pretender at Soudan and repudiates the right of his being the Mehdi or a reformer, be said to create a breach of the friendship? The book in question states that twenty such false claimants arose but were not recognised by the Mahomedan Doctors; the present pretender is, like Abdool Wahab, a disturber of the peace. Where is the proof to shew that the pretender, though not a Mehdi, is still a reformer? What more can be written to refute the claims of the pretender

of Soudan ? The objection is taken against the tone and spirit of the book, its contents and the conclusion drawn therein. But my explanation to the objections shall receive cordial support from persons who have the sense to understand the book.

Fifth Objection.

“The HIDAYAT-US-SAIL is in the Persian language. It seems to me that the object of the book is to incite the Mahomedans in India to wage war against the British Government. In 1881 the Government offered pardon to the Nawab but at that time the book in question was not taken into consideration. I would cite some sentences which have been translated into Urdu in support of my views.”

Explanation. The book in question was published in 1292 A.H. *i.e.* two years before the Government conveyed its censure. The Resident takes objection to some passages on the ground, that it was not produced before the Government, but the warning given to me was meant to stop any further publication of the book called the DEWAN KHUTAB or a book of that kind. If it be conceded that the book in question is seditious, the order of the Government was meant for future guidance and any objection on this score is uncalled for. But I am prepared to shew that the tone of the book is not seditious. There is not a single passage in the book which speaks of Jehad, or incites the people to fight.

The passages quoted by the Resident are in the form of interrogatories and answers. The interrogatories only are given below with my remarks.

Q. I. Is it proper to allow the KAFFIRS to live in Arabia ?

The answer given in my book is a translation of a pamphlet called BUNIAN. At page 91 line 10 it is stated that in the days of Syed Alloma Hossein, son of Ahmed Jallal, a resident of Yemen, some Hindu grain dealers had been to Yemen. The Syed was asked to give an opinion as to the propriety of granting or withholding permission to the Hindus. The Syed in describing the KAFFIRS (infidels) spoke of the Mashrakin Arabs, Mosaics and others as described in the texts of the Hadis, and expressed his views. The *Nasara* (Nazarenes) means the residents of Nazareth at the time of Mahommed. This conversation has been recorded in the BAKHARI, MUSLIM, and other books, which have been published at Delhi and Bombay. This dialogue has been the subject of commentaries by Noudee and others. It is also to be found in MISHKAD and its Urdu and Persian translations with explanatory notes, which are available in India. At page 90 line 2 in my book, I have stated that the Hanifas consider it improper to expel the Nazarenes from Arabia.

Thus it will appear that the passage referred to is not an expression of my own opinion. It has been referred to in many religious books without any protest on the part of the Government and I am at a loss to make out why objection has been taken to it.

The second question referred to by the Resident is as follows :—

“ Whether the Musalmans should reside in the

country formerly owned by them and conquered by the KAFFIRS."

Explanation. The question and reply are dealt with in the book at pages 94 to 103. At page 99 the name of the author, whose views are set forth in the book, is given. The famous eight interrogatories and replies of Abdool Rahaman, son of Suleman, are given. Syed Abdool Barree of Zobair published an Arabic treatise on the interrogatories. The translation of it without any comment on my part has been given in the book. There is nothing of Jehad in the interrogatories and replies. My object in citing the *Futwas* is to discuss on the question whether India is **DAR-UL ISLAM** (land of peace) or **DAR-UL-HARB** (land of war). At page 130 I have expressed my own views and India has been put in the category of **DAR-UL ISLAM**. Some learned Doctors of the Hanifa sect were of opinion that India is **DAR-UL HARB**, but they never declared Jehad against the British Government, and peacefully repaired to Mecca. My object is to remove the false impression of the Mahomedan Doctors who consider India as **Dar-ul-Harb**.

At page 114 I have discussed on the Wahabee creed and expressed my views at length in repudiation of it.

The following is a quotation from my book—

“To call every follower of Islam in the East and the West—an adherent of Abdool Wahab, a follower of his creed and a Wahabee—is to say the least of it a cruel departure from justice—a murder of right

and a false accusation against an innocent man. May Allah save me from evils and sins." Page 115, line 8.

At page 115, line 17, the following sentences occur. "Speak not of the Wahabeees and their enemies. They are long since at daggers-drawn and it is past all hopes of their being at quits."

The subject has been thus concluded by me—"It is not incumbent upon me to follow Mahommed, son of Abdool Wahab, or Mahommed Ismail of Delhi."

Actuated by malice some Mahomedans are called Wahabeees by their enemies so that the vials of wrath may be poured down on their heads. I have shewn the impropriety of such charges. India is DAR-UL ISLAM and there is no Kazi or Mufti to incite the Mahomedans to a war against the Government.

The Resident has taken objections to the passages which are taken from a Treatise called SAEFTABAR. I have not expressed my concurrence with the views of the author of the Treatise. On the other hand, the HIDAYET-US-SAIL will shew my own views. In this book I have collected the maxims of others and expressed my own views which are not likely open to censure. The collection of authorities and opinions on religious matters is not an act calculated to excite sedition. No religious matter can be thoroughly discussed until the religious books are quoted and the opinions of the Theologues and Doctors are cited. The object of citing the authorities has been totally overlooked by the Resident. The conclusion, at which I have arrived, is that India is DAR-UL ISLAM—a conclusion which decidedly favors

the cause of the Government. If my views are accepted by my co-religionists, they will cease to entertain any notions of Jehad; they will consider it a sin to break the Treaty and lastly they will not be guided by the mischievous Doctors.

S. H.

PART I.

SEC IV.—Cl (c) *A brief explanation with the memorandum dated the 2nd September 1885, of the State, forwarded to the Resident.*

A TRUE COPY OF THE EXPLANATION SENT TO THE RESIDENT ON THE 2ND SEPTEMBER 1885.

I have seen carefully the remarks of the Resident. The translation of which was read out by him to the Ruler, on the 28th March 1885, in my presence and which were forwarded to the State with a memorandum on the 31st August 1885. It seems that the four books composed by me are supposed to be against the Government and it was for this reason I was asked to forward an explanation. The following explanation was given;

1st. Objection against the DEWAN KHUTUB *alias* SANATUL KAMILA.

The DEWAN KHUTAB or SANATUL KAMILA was not composed by me. The book composed by me is called Moiz Hosna a collection of the prayers offered on Friday throughout the year and composed by the learned Doctors of the olden days. The preface gives the names of those Doctors. The book, in question, is not my composition. It contains no KHUTBA against the British Government; but deals with prayers and benedictions. In the conclusion of the book a KHUTBA composed by Moulovic Mahomul Ismail of Delihi is to be found but it

does not preach *Jehad* against the British Government. The maxims on JEHAD are given therein like those in the KORAN and other religious books. The KHUTBAS collected were, several times, published at Calcutta and Bombay. On the 21st March 1881, Col. Bannerman censured me for the KHUTBA of Ismail of Delhi; and all copies of the KHUTBAS in question which were available at the time, were produced before, and destroyed by him. The Resident remarks—"How far has the Nawab carried out the orders of the Government? I have carried out the orders of the Government to the best of my power. The book was published without the KHUTBA in question. Since then I did not collect any KHUTBA of the kind. On the other hand I published books in support of the Government, and in opposition to KHUTBA in question, as will be hereinafter stated.

2nd. Objection against the "GAIRBAL." Sir Lepel has dwelt upon the objections at great length in his remarks. I am responsible for it to this extent only that the history was caused by the Begum to be written by me. There were four parts, and one part only was about to be published when it was sent for by the Resident, but in reply the Ruler promised to send it on its completion. The time for completion did not arrive nor was there any circulation of it. There were two kinds of subjects dealt with in the book. One was the narration of private events and the conduct of the daughter and son-in law and the state-members. The correctness o

otherwise of the narration can be certified by the Begum. I had nothing to do with the private events nor did I express my views to the prejudice of the daughter and others. No body is dissatisfied with his children at the instigation of others, until he is assured of the improper conduct with ocular and auricular proofs.

The other subject dealt with, is the account of the trip to Calcutta, which was recorded in the office and which may be verified by the office papers. History as a rule deals with true facts and no history is an exception to it, in whatever language it is written. The history of Bedaun written in the days of Akbar is full of condemnation of his conduct and actions. The history of Babar composed by him speaks of his proper and improper conduct. The object of the historian is to collect all true events. The Begum did not publish or circulate the book. It is not with me. It is for this reason that the Resident justly remarks—"that in as much as the circulation of the book in question has not been made I do not deem it proper to argue on the subject in full detail"

3rd. Objection against the TURJAMAN-WAHABEA—which deals with the facts and circumstances of the Wahabee sect taken from the Arabic histories composed by the Christian and other authors and their names are cited in the book. The book is meant to prove that the Mahomedans of India are not hostile to the British Government. Out of sheer enmity one calls the other Wahabee and annoys him. The book is

in the nature of a history. The real object in publishing the book is that the Government may not suspect its subjects—who are bound to be grateful for the blessings they enjoy. It is for this reason that the newspapers have commended the book. The Indian Chronicle, an English paper, in its issue of the 6th April 1885, says in commenting on the book that the sensible and just men and the British Government should be thankful to the Nawab. I am not acquainted with the Editor who has done justice to the book. If the book had been hostile to the Government, the Editor would not have paid such compliments, but on the other hand would have condemned it. The book was presented to Lord Ripon by the Begum for which thanks were conveyed by him in a letter dated the 28th December 1884.

The Resident writes that the preface was composed by Akbar Alim, but it was cancelled, and in lieu of it, another was composed by the Nawab against the express wishes of the translator.

The preface does not breathe a single word against the Government. I did not request the translator to write any preface. I am not acquainted with the English language.

The Resident writes to say that in the book in question, it has been argued that the Mahomedans in India who are called Wahabees are sincere, faithful and peace-abiding men."

I cannot make out what objection can be taken to it, especially when I affirm that there are no

Wahabees in India. They are said to live in Nejed. One, out of enmity, calls another Wahabee, though in reality he is not. The British Government is aware of this, and hence the people are grateful to it, and enjoy their days happily and peacefully. The men who are called Wahabees by their enemies never created any disturbance against the Government. If they had been Wahabees they would have been found out. The book referred to tends rather to keep up the tranquility in the land.

4th. Objection against IQTRAB SAYA which deals with the past, present and future events which are set forth uniformly in all religious books of the Mahomedans. Moreover it is a translation of the ISHA-ASHRAD-U-SAYA which is famous for the Resurrection. In the book wherever the promised Mehdi is mentioned, the false claims of the Mehdi of Soudan have been proved. This is not in opposition to the Government, but is consistent with the faith of the ISLAMITES. The remark that the day of the promised Mehdi is at hand, has been often said in all religious books, but no date has been specified. It does not follow that the Mehdi of Soudan is the promised Mehdi whose advent is at hand. The prayers of the learned Doctors in days gone-by repeat the same thing. The prayers run thus:—"May my resurrection take place simultaneously with the advent of the Mehdi and Messiah. May God offer me a seat with Mehdi and Messiah on the judgment day."

SHAHABUDIN SAHERWARDY."

" Whosoever sees Mahammed Mehdi may offer my Salams to him."

SHAH KHOBULLA.

SHAH WALI-ULLAH, Mohadis of Delhi, in his will enjoined on giving his *Salams* to Messiah.

The above passages do not shew that the day of the advent of the true Mehdi is the day of the appearance of the false Mehdi; the promised Mehdi and the Messiah of the Christians will appear simultaneously. The preface in the book in question speaks of twenty such false Mehdis who have gone by. Similarly the Mehdi of Soudan is another false Mehdi. The object of this book is to prevent the ignorant Mahomedans recognising the false pretender at Soudan as the true Mehdi. The promised Mehdi, who is spoken of in all religious books of the Sheas and Sunnis, will appear simultaneously with the Messiah—a fact known to all Mahomedans, but no date has been fixed for it. The circumstances and signs, as described in all religious books, are quoted in my book to keep the Mahomedans on their guard so that they may not be misled and imposed on by false Mehdi. My first object was to support the Government and my second object was to save my co-religionists from errors. The Resident has misconstrued some sentences in the book against its context. This will be corroborated by men who are acquainted with the HADIS and who are alive to a sense of justice. In this book it is written that at the time of the promised Mehdi, the kings of India

will be brought before him on arrest. This is only a translation of the book referred to above which is accessible at all places. The names of the Kings are not mentioned, directly or indirectly, in the original books ; nor in their translations, nor in the Hadis. The original book speaks of "MOOLOOK HIND" without specifying the era. (Note.—In chapter III of the original book it is written that this book was complied at Medina in 1076 A. H.) The phrase "*Moolook Hind*," as used in the book in the chapter on resurrection, cannot directly or by implication refer to the Queen of England and the Empress of India. The Mehdi of Soudan has been compared with Abdool Wahab with this object that the Musulmans in India may not have anything to do with the false Mehdi, in the same way as they had nothing to do with Abdool Wahab. The claims of the false Mehdi like those of Wahab have no foundation. There is not a single word in the book to shew that the false Mehdi is a prophet, as has been understood, and referred to, by the Resident. No Mussalman, literate or illiterate, professes to accept the pretender as a Prophet, as no prophet is expected. The professions of each claimant should not be accepted. One who professes to be a reformer is believed with the greatest caution, but the reformation is not necessarily followed by Jehad—such are the sentiments in my writings. How can objection be taken to this ? On the other hand I have shewn that the false Mehdi is not a reformer. His claims are only stated in the news-

papers and all such statements are not true. At page 121 in my book I have dwelt on this point forcibly, stating that the Mussulmans are inclined to believe every Mehdi or reformer when they hear a Bazar-Gossip; this is in refutation of the false claims of the Soudan man. The Resident is inclined to think that according to my views if the Mehdi of Soudan proves to be a Syed, he will be deemed as the true Mehdi—a hypothesis not borne out by any passage in my book or by the beliefs of the Mahomedans. The Hadis, which are deemed less authoritative, do not even mention the appearance of the promised Mehdi at Soudan, be he a Syed or Sheik. The false Mehdi may claim thousand times to be a Syed, but he can never be deemed as the true Mehdi, as it is against the established faith of Islam—at Medina alone will the promised Mehdi be born.

5th. Objection against the HIDYET-US-SAIL. The maxims stated therein are alleged to be adverse to the British Government as will appear from the sentences quoted from it.

At pages from 94, query 32, to page 104, query 39, the interrogatories and replies known as the eight queries, are given; they are the translation of an Arabic treatise composed by Abdoola, son of Abdool Barry, who was born in Arabia. The HIDAYET-US-SAIL is a collection of several treatises translated, but was not composed by me. One who expresses his original thoughts and ideas in his writings and logically supports his own views,

is said to compose a book. The book in question consists of texts of others, quoted at random and arranged systematically without testing the correctness or otherwise of the texts. The queries, numbered eight referred to above, have been translated literally from the original Arabic book. In the original book the author has condemned all creeds other than Mahommadanism. The Mahomedan dissenters, the four inspired books, the Mosaics and others have been also condemned. The English Government in India has not been traduced anywhere nor is there any mention of Jehad. Different kinds of theological texts are cited therein and the eight queries are also quoted from a different author. In support of my contention that the translation has only been made by me I may refer to any learned man to see the original book. There are passages in the original book which may be considered to be in support of Wahabeeism or the theory of DAR-UL HARB. They have been translated but I have added two interrogatories with their replies; one is an express repudiation of Wahabeeism *vide* page 111 and the other has reference to DAR-UL HARB *vide* page 130. I have proved that India is *Dar-ul-Islam* and not *Dar-ul-harb*. These two questions and answers are given in refutation of the famous eight queries; and I am responsible for this writing only as it is neither borrowed nor translated. The HIDAYET-US-SAIL is a translation and compilation from the Arabic books in the same way as texts *pro* and *con* are collected

and compiled in religious books. Moreover the *Hidayet-us-Sail* was compiled ten years ago long before the *Mujmiah Khutab*, but all the copies have been disposed of.

I have a fancy to all learned books in the Arabic language, and some of them I have translated. As a resident in a native state I am not aware of the law which prohibits the translation and compilation of the books. In every country religious books are compiled; the Mahomedans and Christians carry on their religious controversy in their books but that is not considered objectionable; such writings and arguments have not created disturbances anywhere. But this is beside the question. Since the day I was censured by Col. Bannerman for the book composed by others, I have not translated or published any book of the kind. I have published treatises on two maxims based on religion with the object of shewing to the Government my gratitude and thankfulness for the rank and dignity conferred on me. No loyal Mussalman or well-wisher of the Government has surpassed me in the mode I have observed in the two books. Those treatises also have been called seditious. I send them for the perusal of the Government. At page 33 I have clearly stated that the requirements of the *Jehad* are wanting and at page 39, I have dwelt on the evils of the breach of the Treaties. Both these subjects have been discussed after a reference to all religious books. The same subjects

have been treated in the form of two questions and answers in the HIDAYET-US-SAIL and in the MAHADUL OBAID. If any thing objectionable was written in any book it was borrowed or translated from others; but I have not written anything in its support. Since the day I was censured, I have given up the habit of translating the books. The Resident and the Government of India, the fountain of justice, will be good enough to see my own treatises and compositions referred to above, to ascertain how far have I supported the government in its cause, how I have dwelt on the Jehad to induce the Mahomedans to give it up and how I have explained to the Native chiefs the desirability of observing the Treaties and to be friendly towards the Paramount Power. It would be a monstrous ingratitude and huge folly on my part to write or do intentionally such things against the British Government, to whom I owe an immense debt of endless gratitude, —— a government which conferred on me rank and dignity on the ground that I am a relative of a faithful and devoted chief. Such a conduct is monstrous ingratitude to my benefactress. I am in Bhopal from my boyhood. The late Secundar Begum treated me kindly and respectfully before the mutiny. I have been here for the last thirty-two years. I have not committed any act which might be deemed adverse to the Government, and the State, otherwise I would not have permitted me to stay here. I have been always engaged in studies of the

Arabic books. I had no leisure to read the laws of the Indian Legislature ; otherwise I would not have been reduced to such a plight, such charges would not have been brought against me and I would not have been deemed an enemy of the Government. In reality I am a faithful and devoted adherent of the Government since I have been the Consort to Her Highness the Begum. I have never been sparing to render every help to the Government agreeable to the wishes of the Ruler, as in the instances of the Cabul War, Soudan war, and carrying out the orders of the Resident and the Political Agent. One thing peculiar in the Bhopal state is that religious discussion and fanaticism against Christianity and Wahabeeism have never found a place. I trust that the answer which is given by me, in the sincerity of my heart, with the two treatises may be submitted to the Government of India and that respectable Doctors, learned in the HADIS and residing in India, who are well conversant with the tone and spirit of the book, and who are loyal and devoted subjects of the Government, may be referred to for testing the book and my statement.

S. H.

PART 1.

SECTION 5.—*A general explanation on the books compiled and composed by me.*

The total number of books, compiled and published by me, is eighty; out of them *Tafsir-Futhol-Bayan* forms the largest volume and the small treatises containing maxims, which form the largest portion of my work, consist of two pages. All these books treat of twenty-eight different subjects and do not exclusively deal with religion. Out of these, ten were published at Constantinople, seven in Egypt and the rest at Bhopal, Cawnpore, Delhi, Agra and other places. Some were published by some proprietors of Press of their own accord and not at my request; for example the proprietor of the Jawa-ib Press published *Bulaqafi-usul-illoga*, *Nashootus-Sakran*, *Gasnool-bayan* and *Loquit-ul-Ijlan*. The publishers of these books are generally of the Hanifa sect, who, as a rule, do not publish books which are against their own creed, especially the Turks and the Egyptians who are bigoted followers of the Hanifa creed and have laws prohibiting them to publish books against their religion; if my books savour of Wahabeeism they would not have published them. The Khedive and the Sultan are the followers of the Hanifa creed. Mahommed-ali Pasha

was the person who expelled the Wahabees from Arabia as is described in the history published in Egypt. The Sultan of Turkey does not allow the publication of any book against his religion within his territory and the Bolak Press in Egypt and the Jawaib Press at Constantinople are within his jurisdiction. But the books on *Fika* (Theology) published there by the followers of Hanifa, contain *Jehad*, *inter alia* with the prayers and benedictions similar to the books published at Delhi, Calcutta, Lucknow, Bombay and Meerat. Both in India and Turkey these books are wide in circulation. Eight of my books speak of *Jehad*, prayers, and benedictions like the books on Theology without any spark of Wahabeeism. Of the eight books four are in the Arabic, two in the Urdu and two in the Persian language. They contain the general maxims and sayings on *Jehad* as written in the books of the Hanifas from the olden days. Is there any theological book among the Mahomedans which is without it? Not to speak of the Shafi and Maliki sects, the books of the Hanifa sect alone may be read; they are published in all languages and are widely circulated throughout India. Is there any book which has no chapter on *Jehad*? The reason of my mentioning this is that according to the opinion of the Englishmen, the followers of the Hanifa sect are not Wahabees. Their books speak of *Jehad* similarly, as the books of the *Ahal Hadis* sect. *Vide Durlul Mooktear, Raddul Mooktear, Tahtavi, Baharek-raik, Kunz, Qadury, Futwa-*

Serajya, Khazinatul-Mooftee, Ashiao Nazair, Jama-ul-Romuz, Futavi-Gaisia, Futavi-Ibrahim-Shahi, Kankia, Jama-saghir, Futavi-Bujazia, Jauhirul Futavi, Shareh Dahbaniah, Fusool-Amadia, Moojtabi, Kholasa, Futwa Alamghiri, Futwa Kazi Khan, Hidaya, Shara Bakaya. Out of these books the *Shara-Bakaya* has been translated into Urdu and Persian and commands a large circulation. The *Dar-ul-Mooktear* has been translated into Urdu and published. These books are widely circulated throughout India. The Hanifa sect cites the *Futwas* from these books.

The book on *Fika* of the Shafi sect has been published in Egypt and circulated throughout the world. Similarly among the Maliki and Hambili sects the book on *Fika* is wide in circulation. In all these books there is a chapter on *Jehad*. At Calcutta, Bombay, Lahore and other places, the *Hadis* such as *Seah Satta, Sunun, Darmi Blugulmaram, Mishkad* and others have been published several times and circulated. The Urdu and Persian translations of the *Mishkad*, the Urdu translation of the *Mishara-kul-anwar*, and the Urdu translation of the *Korane*, contain *Jehad*, its advantages, orders &c, more or less, either in the body or in the annotation of the books. The Urdu translations of the *MUSLIM* was published at Calcutta; the Persian and Urdu translations of the *Mishkad* were published at Calcutta and Bombay. All these books contain chapters on prayers, benedictions, and *jehads*. Similarly the *Rauza-Nadya*, the *Muskul-khutam*,

Futwah-ul-ilam, the *Nahaj Mukbul*, the *Bunian Marsoos* and others and their translations contain a chapter on *Jehad*, but nowhere it is enjoined to declare *Jehad* against the Government. All the books of the *Hanifa* sect and my eight books contain a chapter among others on *Jehad*. On the other hand there are many books published in India containing several chapters on *Jehad*. In some of my treatises, a few pages or leaves speak of *Jehad*. I cannot make out why I have been especially charged for this compilation. Of course I could be suspected if I had treated *Jehad* in my book against the general practice of the *Hanifa*, *Shea* and *Shafi* sects, or if I had directed or incited war against the Government in the translation, issued any *futwa* to wage war against the Government, or any other Ruler, collected any sinews of war, entertained any mutineer in the State, spoken of *Jehad* at any private meeting, or been a *Kazi*, *Mufti*, *Moh-tasib*, *Waiz* (Preacher), a *Naseh* (Instructor). As a matter of fact the books, compiled by me, are the translations of the books, composed and published long since in the Persian and Arabic languages and circulated all around. The books, compiled or composed by me, do not contain a passage to which objection can be taken by the English Government; the passages have been misinterpreted and a false charge has been brought against me.

Why should those, who translated into Urdu

the *Shera-Vakaya*, the *Dur-ul-Mooktar*, the *Musheri-kul-Anwar*, the *Mishkat-Shareef* and others in which the maxims on *Jehad* are stated or the *Koran* and the *Hadis*, escape the censure ? The books compiled by me treat of twenty-eight different subjects ; out of them six or seven books speak of the *Fikah* and the rest consist of Dictionary, Vocabulary, History and Biography of Soofia, Poems, Biography of the Poets and others. The books themselves if examined will bear me out. Some books treat of religion, like the *Hadis* and the *Fikah*, which have been published from a long time, in British India without protest. Moreover the persons who made the collection of the *Hadis* and the *Fikah* are not Wahabeees according to the historians and others. The disturbances of the Wahabeees came to an end in 1818 and the *Ilm Hadis* and the *Fikah* were published and circulated long before and since the disturbance of the Wahabeees. They are read in the schools and considered authorities from which *Futwas* are quoted by the kazis. A certificate of proficiency in these books is a thing which one is proud of ; the followers of Hanifa sect, as a matter of course read and teach *Mis-kat-sharif* and obtain a certificate on the subject. The learned Doctors of Delhi belong to the Hanifa sect from olden times such as Shaikh Abdool Huq of Delhi, and the descendants of Shah-Wali-ullah *Mahadis* of Delhi. The Shaikh wrote out two commentaries on the *Mishkat*, one in the Arabic language called the *Lamat*, and the other the *Ishat-*

ul-Lamat, in the Persian language. The two aforesaid commentaries and the *Markat-shureh-miskat*, written by Mallah Alikeri of the Hanifa sect, are generally read in India and other places. In all these books, the maxims on Jehad have been set forth. The translation of the *Mishkat* was published at Calcutta and Bombay, and has been in circulation throughout India. The descendants of Shah Wali-ullah obtain certificates in the *Hadis*. The late Moulovie Kutab-udin, a distinguished member of the Delhi family, translated *Mishkat* into Urdu and the translation, known as the *Mazaharul-huq*, was published at Delhi and other places; but the original book and its translation nowhere caused any disturbance nor did the Government take exception to it. The translator was not called a Wahabee nor any extreme step was taken against him by the Government as in my case. Under the above circumstances how can a charge be sustained against me until and unless it is done in the interest of my step-daughter, her husband and her two half-brothers, or for some other reasons not known to me ? Has any disturbance been caused by the publication of these books ? No book contains more stirring passages on Jehad than the Koran which is read by the old and young, and males and females, among the Mahomedans, but never has a Jehad been declared by any against the Government. No disturbance has been caused by my books, or by those published long since by the followers of the Hanifa sect. In 1881 I was

verbally admonished for the publication of the *Khutba* of Moulovie Ismail of Delhi. Within the last six years I have not written any thing on *Jehad*, directly or indirectly, in my books, composed or translated; of course in my theological books published before 1881, I dwelt on *Jehad* on the lines of the Theologues. The *Ibrat*, which deals with *Jehad*, was compiled by me, in the same way as the author of the *Kamoosool-loga* has compiled the maxims of *Jehad*, in his treatises named the *Ketab-Ijtihad-fi-talebul-jehad* and the *Al-if-tizaz-fi-if-trazul-jehad*, or as Shaik Ahmed, son of Abdool Rub, compiled a work on *Jehad* called the *Aqd-forid*. These books were published in Egypt. The *Masharool-ashway-ala-masaroot-us-hug* was compiled by Mahi-udin-Ahmed, son of Ibrahim of Nakhas, and also Mooshki from thirty-one different works. It contains twenty-one chapters on *Jehad*. It is a voluminous book and is famous for its treatment of *Jehad*. The *Ibrat* was published in 1294 A. H., two years before the publication of the KHUTBA of Moulovie Ismail, but it is out of print.

In 1293 A. H., the Turkish war broke out and the Indian Mahomedans sent subscriptions to the Sultan, with the permission and approval of the British Government, at such a time, a short treatise called *Ibrat*, consisting of five chapters, was prepared with the express object of putting down the cupidity of Russia. It begins with *Jehad* as given in the *Hadis* in the form of a glossary; the first and second chapters are quotations

from the *Koran* on *Jehad*, the third and fourth chapters treat of orders and the *Hadis*, and the fifth chapter treats of the martyrs of the higher and lower kinds besides *Jehad*. The conclusion is an investigation on the subject of the leaving of the country of the *Kaffirs*. This treatise consists of 154 pages and like the *Fika* is an abstract of *Futhool Barry* and *Sharah Sahi Bokhari &c.*

All these books of theology are in wide circulation and read and taught throughout India and Egypt.

This year (i. e. 1886) a book called the *Assabafimoruful-Sahabea* was published at Calcutta. It speaks of the *Sahaba* (the adherents of Mahammed) and their *jehad* and war. In my treatise called the *Ibrat* I have dwelt at length on *Jehad* and the conflicting opinions of the *Hanifas* and other sects; I have also shewn that it is our bounden duty to be obedient and loyal to the Ruler under whom we enjoy safety and protection and also to avoid sedition in all possible ways. I have described forty one kinds of martyrs other than those who preach *Jehad*. I have also referred to the maxims on *Hijrat* i. e. leaving *Dar-ul-Harb* (the land of the *Kaffirs*) for *Dar-ul-Islam* (land of safety), of the *Hanifa*, *Shafi*, and *Ahl-Hadis* sects and in conclusion I have expressed doubts on these maxims as they are not consistent with the *Shara*. At page 139, line 12, I have shewn the expediency and safety of avoiding the doubtful *Hadis* to preserve the faith and dignity of one. Again at page 140, line 9 the purport of the treatise *Saeftabor* is clearly set forth.

This is the treatise of Syed Abdoola, son of Abdool Barry, son of Mahommed of late, published in 1271 A. H.); its translation was given in the *Hidayet-us-Sail* to which Sir Lepel Griffin has taken objection, on the score that the book embodies my sayings and views, though the author of the original book is a different person altogether. My writings are in support of the Government such as the *Mawadul Abaid*, the *Rouz Khosib*, the *Turjaman Wahabea*, and the *Iqtrab Saya*.

From these books isolated sentences and passages have been cited to shew that they are hostile to the Government; but they are quite against the context. A reply in detail quoting the sentences from these books, has been given by the editor of *Ishat-us-Soonna* of Lahore and was published in the "Advocate of India" in its supplement. It is given separately and marked App. B.

The opinions of the learned men in India, on my works, are given separately in App. A.

S. H.

PART II.

SECTION. I.

THE CHARGES OF MALADMINISTRATION BY SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN AND THE EXPLANA- TIONS OF SYED SEDIQUE HOSSEIN KHAN.

"The Nawob has reduced the powers of the State officials and taken the whole work in his own hand."

Explanation.

The state papers will shew the powers, with which the officials were invested in the reign of the late Nawob Secandar Begum and the present Ruler. To the best of my knowledge, the powers, jurisdiction and pay of the officials were increased after the accession of the present Ruler to the throne. A table shewing the above facts was forwarded by the state to the Resident who did not moot out the subject again. It was no duty of mine to discharge the duties of any official, to try any case and to inflict punishment on the criminals for any offence, or the officials for any dereliction of duty. These facts could be easily sifted by referring to the office papers, and the falsity or otherwise of the charges will be apparent.

Second Charge.

“The Jaigeers were resumed, or caused to be resumed, by the Nawob.”

Explanation.

The Ruler has the exclusive right to resume a Jaiger, and such right could not be exercised arbitrarily or without rhyme or reason. Jaigeers are bestowed on persons who are loyal to, and in the good graces of, the Ruler, but the resumption is on account of disloyalty or disobedience. There were two cases of resumption in the reign of the present Ruler.

(1) Miah Yasin Mahommed Khan, a jaigerdar, was not on bad terms with me. He was found to be disloyal and rebellious and his property was consequently confiscated. Sir Lepel threatened me when the Ruler was reluctant to restore the Jaiger. The proceedings of Sir Lepel which terminated with the restoration of the Jaiger need no mention as it is a fact notoriously known in Bhopal.

(2) Mufti Russool was attached to the Deori State, and was indebted to it to a large extent. He was suspected to have committed many treasonable acts. He was dismissed from service under the instructions of General Daly. After the death of the Kudsia Begum, the Jaiger of Russool Mufti was confiscated but was subse-

quently restored to him by the Ruler in 1304 A. H., on a petition submitted by him.

The Agent has not cited any instance but has charged me generally. The two cases cited by me will shew whether any charge can be brought home to me. But if I had any hand in the matter of this kind, I should have been treated otherwise by the Resident, for the munificent gifts of the Begum, to her daughter, son-in-law, grand-daughter and others. At any rate I should deem it not proper to dwell upon this point, as the charge is quite vague and indefinite, and I have reasons to believe that it is not well founded.

Third Charge.

“The Nawob has appointed many relatives in the State.”

Explanation.

Since my marriage with the present Ruler I have never recommended any relative or countryman of mine for any post. The late Jamal-udin was a relation of mine by marriage, but he was appointed as the First Minister in the days of the late Secandar Begum. Though a relative, I always kept aloof from him—a fact well-known in Bhopal. Except a cousin (son of maternal uncle) I have no relative who is an official in the State. But this cousin of mine is

not a State official, but a private servant of the Ruler and was appointed in the reign of the late Nawab Secandar Begum.

Fourth Charge.

“In criminal matters the Nawab has committed acts of oppression.”

Explanation :—

It seems that the Agent to the Governor-General presumed my guilt in each and every case in which an official was to blame. The criminal courts take cognisance of criminal matters and I cannot make out how, in the name of justice, I am taken to task for a matter for which I repudiate all my responsibility. The Agent to the Governor-General deemed it proper to interfere in the following cases and the facts, set forth below, will shew how far any blame may rest on me.

(1) Muzbut Singh, a life convict, was let off scot-free by the Political Agent. This man was tried by the Nazim, Eastern Division, and the report, submitted by him, will shew how and of what offences he was convicted. Sir Lepel transferred the case to the court of the Political Agent, and by one stroke of pen all the punishments, inflicted on Muzbut Singh, were cancelled, all the proceedings of the criminal courts were quashed and the notorious Muzbut Singh was allowed to be quite at large in Bhopal.

(2) One Vilayet Hossein was tried and convicted by Akbar Aly and this was well known to Col. Kincaid, the Political Agent. While in prison mortifications set in the legs of the said Vilayet Hossein and it was found unsafe to keep him in prison and so Ahmed Reza, the late minister, released him. Before the release of the prisoner there were some complaints against the said Akbar Aly, and the result was that an inquiry and trial for the charges of misappropriation took place in the court of the second minister named Abdool Aly. It was notoriously known that Abdool Aly was not well-disposed towards the said Akbar Aly, but in spite of this, the inquiry and trial resulted in favor of Akbar Aly. The Resident was pleased to direct the transfer and subsequently the dismissal of the said Akbar Aly and the Ruler did not hesitate to carry out his orders. The old case of Vilayet Hossein was raked up and a criminal charge was brought against Akbar Aly. Under the instructions of Sir Lepel, Akbar Aly was put on his trial in the court of the Political Agent, and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment.

It is alleged that Akbar Aly was a creature of mine and that I countenanced his acts and thereby committed oppression. The above facts shew that, directly or indirectly, I did not lend any kind of support to him. The fact of the release of Vilayet Hossein speaks volumes in favor of the State that justice, and not oppression, was its chief and sole aim. The transfer, dismissal and subsequent trial

of Akbar Aly without any murmur on the part of the State, refute the charge brought against me with regard to Akbar Aly. That he was never my protege will be clear from the fact that he was entertained by the late Secandar Begum.

(3.) Sala-udin, an old servant of the State, was removed from the *kotwali*, degraded on a reduced pay, and was subsequently asked to retire. Col. Kincaid recommended for his pension, but under the orders of Sir Lepel, he was tried by the Political Agent and sentenced to ten years' rigorous imprisonment.

The three important cases are stated above to shew how far I committed acts of oppression by countenancing the officials in charge of the courts. If the Resident means to say, that I countenanced the officials in criminal matters, the cases of Akbar Aly and Salaudin will refute the charge. If he means that in criminal matters I committed acts of oppression on the accused I will refer to the petition of Muzbut Singh to shew that I was not accused of any high-handedness. As a matter of fact, I had nothing to do with the criminal cases.

The charge is as usual vague and indefinite.

Fifth Charge.

“The assessment was hard and there was a general complaint.”

Explanation :—

The Agent to the Governor General brings this charge against me, though I was never a party to the settlement. Even if it be conceded, that I gave advice in this matter, I do not see how a charge, like this, can stand until and unless an inquiry is made and proofs are adduced for the same. The Resident has never inspected the Revenue Records and still he goes the length of bringing a charge against the State, and also against me personally.

In Bhopal, the system is different from what Sir Lepel has seen in the Punjab. The proprietary right vests in the State and the Mastagirs have a qualified right in the collection of the rents.

The settlement began in the days of the late Nawob Secandar Begum, *i. e.*, in 1277 Fuslee. The settlement work was entrusted to Moonshee Wasiat Aly, and the pottahs were granted by Thacoor Prasad Mahatmin Dafter Huzzoor, under the supervision of the late *Madurulmāham*. All inquiries and demarcations were completed by Wasiat Aly and Mahomed Abbas. On the report of the late Madurul Maham, Thacoor Prosad was removed, and Mahomed Hossein was put in his stead, but was subsequently removed. The boundary

marks and the standard rates were fixed by Wasiat Aly with the concurrence of Thacoor Prosad and the State Council. The maps and survey papers bear the signatures of (1) the Survey officer (2) the Girdawar (3) Monserim (4) Sadar Monserim (5) Mohatmim zillah (6) four or five farmers (7) Tehsildar (8) Kanoongoe (9) Putwary. Subsequent to the preparation of the Revenue papers the *Dawl* pottahs were granted to the farmers. The Madarul-Maham and the Revenue officers were strictly warned not to make the assessment with the object of increasing the income of the State. In 1298 A. H. the farmers and tenants were invited by proclamation, to put in objections, if they had any, and the Nazim, Western Zillah, was specially appointed to adjudicate the matters in dispute on the petitions. The remission and modification of the Revenue were ordered in several cases.

The above facts will shew how far the State is to blame. The assessment is lighter in comparison with that in Oude. When and how I interfered in this matter is a question which I fail to solve. I never had any thing to do personally; but supposing for the sake of argument, that I offered advice to the Ruler, how can I be accused when, as a matter of fact, there was remission of the Revenue and the arrears amounted to lacs of rupees, for which the farmers were not harassed.

Sixth Charge.

“The Hindus were forcibly converted by the Nawob, specially the female prisoners.”

Explanation :—

I give an emphatic denial to the charge. I am not aware of any such instance. The Resident did not deem it proper to cite an instance for my edification. All that I can say, in respect to the charge, is that never in the course of my life I used any pressure on any person to change his creed, and such a course I deem to be most objectionable, as the Shera Shureef does not contemplate of forcible conversion without free consent.

Seventh Charge.

“The Hindu Temples were demolished by the Nawob.”

Explanation :—

Within the last forty years two temples of the Hindus were raised to the ground. One by the late Nawob Kudsia Begum, some forty years ago, and another by the late Secandar Begum, thirty years ago.

There was a small old and dilapidated Temple under waters within the Tank called the Shah Jehani. Compensation was awarded to, but refused by, the Poojari.

Such sacrilegious acts were never committed nor caused to be committed by me.

Eighth Charge.

“ The Nawab dismissed the old officials and entertained his proteges in lieu of them.”

Explanation:—

It is not desirable that I should discuss on the propriety and nature of a charge brought against me but it is proper to state barely the facts to meet the accusations. It is out of place to mention the changes effected by Sir Lepel, in the various departments entailing loss on the State.

The officials, numbering 8000, consist of the Hindus and the Mahomedans ; the latter forming the minority. The bulk of these officials were entertained by the late Secandar Begum ; of course the present Begum entertained new men in the places of those who died. The new officials were selected from among the officers and pensioners of the Government, but their number would not exceed eight. These new men are not my relatives, friends or countrymen ; on the other hand, some of them are inimical to my interest and, on this score, got an increment in their pay at the instance of the Resident.

Ninth Charge.

“The breach between the Ruler on one side and her daughter and son-in-law on the other was caused by the Nawab.”

Explanation :—

It is true that there is a rupture between the mother and the daughter, but the question is what led to the rupture? If one takes the trouble to ascertain the real causes, he will, I doubt not, be the last person in this world to shift the charge on my doomed head. It is a fact notoriously known in Bhopal that the Sultan Jehan has, by words and actions, proved disobedient and disloyal to the Ruler. Was the Sultan Jehan instigated by me to be disloyal to her mother? Or did I prevail upon the Ruler to be dissatisfied with her daughter? The first question needs no answer. With regard to the second, I must say that it is incumbent upon my accusers to shew the motive for such an action. If there had been any motive on my part, it must be based either on self-interest or malice. During the life-time of the present Ruler, the heir-apparent has no chance of succeeding to the throne and her powers, in the State as heir-apparent, are absolutely *nil*. If I had been actuated by any desire to exercise powers, the good or ill feeling, of the Begum towards her daughter and son-in-law, is quite irrelevant to the point. The idea of usurping the State, in the life-time or after the death of the Begum, is out of

the question. To satisfy my covetous feelings or cupidity, if had any, I would not adopt such a step, as the Ruler has every right to satisfy me, and her action will inure during her life-time. The Sultan Jehan and her husband could not and can not stand in the way of my ambitious projects. I have been already provided with a rich and considerable Jaiger, and my children have been similarly provided. Moreover any attempt to improve the prospects of my children, the fruits of my first marriage, at the cost of the State, will be quite infructuose. Thus the acquisition of wealth, or the usurpation of any powers in the State, can not be checked by the Sultan Jehan and her husband.

As regards malice, I do not remember any instance in which my feelings were excited against the couple. Since my marriage, I took considerable interest in the welfare of Ahmed Aly and the Sultan Jehan. It was I who recommended the former to the Begum before the marriage; it was I who watched the education and training of the young man, and lastly it was I who tried utmost to bring round Ahmed Aly from his reckless and bad habits.

The Sultan Jehan incurred the displeasure of her mother, on account of her unbecoming conduct, and I would ask Her Highness to say whether or not I interceded in behalf of her daughter.

I am exceedingly sorry to find that a false charge has been brought against me. For some time past, I have cut off all connection with the outside world and have turned my undivided

attention to prayers and thanksgivings to Allah, and I consider it to be a great sin to cause rupture between a mother and a daughter. I am afraid that Sir Lepel has been misinformed on this point and I am almost sanguine that an inquiry will lead to a different conclusion altogether.

Tenth Charge.

“The Nawab collected one thousand Wahabees among the officials in the State.”

Explanation :—

The Resident was asked to furnish a list of the officials who were Wahabees but he gave a list of the following ten persons.

1. Abdool Majid Khan, Mahatmim State Press, serving the State since the time of the late Secandar Begum.
2. Moulovie Enayet-ullah, a resident of Bombay. This man never came to Bhopal. He died long since.
3. Moulovie Wahid-u-Zuma. This is an official of the Hyderabad State and has never been to Bhopal. His brother Budi-u-Zuma was in service for some time but was dismissed on a charge of misappropriation of the State property.
4. Moulovie Bashir Shaheb, Mahatmim Madrasa Sulemani.
5. Moulovie Abdool Baree, the assistant of Moulovie Bashir.

6. Mahammed Yasin, Mahatmim Masorif.
7. Kazi Saheb. He has relatives who hold respectable posts under the British Government. He resigned of his own accord.
8. Hakim Mahammed Khan, Mahatmim Charitable dispensaries.
9. Syed Jamil Ahmed, Mohurrer.
10. Hafiz Karamut-ullah, Contractor of the Press.

The above officials produced certificates and letters in English, copies of which are kept in the office, before they were appointed. Sir Lepel did not deem it necessary to dismiss them when he took the administration under his own supervision, though he had reasons (of his own) to believe that they were Wahabees.

Eleventh Charge.

“The administration was open to eleven charges as set forth in the letters of the Resident, of the 16th February and the 26th February repectively.”

Explanation :—

I believe that Abdool Aly, the late second minister, wrote out the explanations of the State, in reply to the eleven charges, brought by Sir Lepel and they were sent on the 28th February 1886. I do not know whether the Resident was satisfied with the explanations, but it seems that

he was not, as immediately after, he introduced changes in the administration. The explanations of the State, I believe, are quite sufficient to meet the charges.

Twelfth Charge.

“The Urduoo newspapers were instigated by the Nawab to write strong articles in favor of the old systems and against the new ones.”

Explanation:—

The names of the newspapers are not specified; I am not a subscriber to any newspaper nor have I any connection with any journal. If there are articles in the newspapers against the new systems, the Editors should be taken to task. But I cannot help remarking that some English newspapers have attacked me mercilessly, and the way, in which the articles were written, leads me to believe that they were inspired by some one who had access to the State-papers.

S. H.

PART II.

SECTION II.

Summary of the charges and explanations.

The charges brought against me may be thus summed up :

- (1) That I have committed treason in publishing the *Khutabs*;
- (2) That I have committed oppression by means of the severe assessment on land, thereby impoverishing the people and depopulating the villages;
- (3) That I have committed oppression by holding the reins of administration; the police and the courts have been converted into engines of oppression;
- (4) That I have bought some newspapers to wreak my vengeance on the Government which has deprived me of my title and salute and reduced me to a cipher in the State, and to oppose the reforms now introduced.

In dealing with the charges brought against me by Sir Lepel, I have taken into consideration all these specific instances cited by him, in support of the charges, and in reply thereto I have not failed to state the true facts and circumstances in each particular case. Sir Lepel is under the impression that I had supreme command over all the departments, and the officials of the State were all my proteges. The maladministration has

been going on for years, in spite of the favorable reports submitted by his predecessors. Thus the charges must either be substantiated or met by stern facts and as Sir Lepel, who represents the Government, is the prosecutor, I must say in the name of fairness and justice, that such charges should be proved or repudiated before a third person on behalf of the Government of India. It is not proper for me to say any thing against Sir Lepel, but I could not, in vindication of my conduct, help touching incidently these facts which shew the *animus* of Sir Lepel.

Sir Lepel Griffin, I understand, was assured on more than one occasion by the Ruler, that I had no hand in the administration, but this assurance was not accepted. The late minister Ahmed Reza was dismissed for his negligence and incompetence, yet it is said that he was treated in an unworthy manner, and for this reason threats were held out to me.

Yasin Mahommed was found guilty, during the incumbency of General Daly and his Jaiger was confiscated. After a long interval, the old case was raked up to accuse me of diabolical acts and I was threatened to pay compensation to Yasin Mahommed.

For reasons quite incomprehensible to me, Sir Lepel was determined, from a long time to banish me from Bhopal, and he expressed his determination most clearly, both in writing and verbal talk. All the opprobious and abusive epithets,

exceeding the limits of propriety and decorum, were used, publicly and privately, to vilify me.

The above facts will give an idea of the character of the formidable prosecutor, who has succeeded in proving me guilty behind my back.

With regard to the first charge, much has been said of the warning given to me in 1881, by the Government of India. It is alleged, that I incurred the displeasure of Lord Ripon's Government, for the publication of the *Khutub* of Moulovie Ismail of Delhi. It has never been my aim to call in question the order of the Government of India, and as a warning was given to me with the best motives, I accepted it with a loyal heart. But it appears now to me that my loyalty is called in question, hence a serious charge, like this, should not remain unanswered. The explanation, given by me, with regard to the *Khutub* of Moulovie Ismail, will shew that it was not a treasonable act on my part. The *Tarjaman-Wahabea* was presented to Lord Ripon, and not a single word is incidentally mentioned of my conduct, in the letter acknowledging the receipt of the book, by his Private Secretary. I have shewn in my explanations, Part I., Sec. II., Sec. III., Clause (C), Sec. IV., Clauses (B and C) and Sec. V., that the books, to which objections have been taken, are not what they have been represented to be. I deny emphatically the charge of treason, and I am prepared to shew that I am right in my views. Some passages have been quoted to shew sedition, but they

have been twisted and turned in a way which no scholar, in Arabic, Persian and Urdu languages, will do without violence to the language and sense. It is a matter of deep regret, that although the books, which I have published, are in support of the Government, both in tone and spirit, yet they have been wholly misunderstood, and a charge has been brought against me. The books have been already published, and I challenge any Arabic Scholar to come forward and to criticise it atomically and find out any passage against the Government, in which my views have been expressed. Ahmed Reza and his creatures had reasons to misconstrue the sentences, but why should not a distinguished Arabic scholar, thoroughly loyal to the British Government, be asked to read the books and pass his opinions before me? The matter is thus simplified, and the point in issue may be easily disposed of.

Second Charge.

It speaks of the impoverishment of the people, and the depopulation of villages, caused by the severe assessment.

That the people have been impoverished is the cry of the prosecutor. The poverty of a country is no doubt deprecated by the liberal philanthropists. But it is a question which is open to solutions of various kinds. The facts and figures are occasionally quoted to prove the theory, but a true statesman does not necessarily accept the

conclusion, even admitting the correctness of the figures. The poverty of India is an intricate problem of the day, but has there been a *consensus* of opinion on the subject? In Bhopal the taxes have been reduced or abolished, corn-duty has been repealed, trade has become brisk, railway has been opened, and every facility is afforded to the suitors without increasing the stamp and the other duties, yet the country is verging on ruin as the land assessment is severe!! As a necessary consequence it is said that the villages have been depopulated. The census does not help to shew depopulation. The migration of a number of men to Bhilsa is pointed out as a proof of depopulation, and this number is said to be exceedingly large. When proofs were wanted to shew the accuracy of the number, the Agent to the Governor-General did not deem it proper to continue the controversy. But it is said that the land assessment is very severe, as the revenue has been increased. The farmers and tenants may certainly complain that there has been an increase of revenue. But have not time and circumstances changed? The value of the commodities has increased, the waste lands have been converted into culturable ones, and trade has become brisk, why should there be no increase of revenue? Look at the different administrations under the British Government—the Central Provinces, the Deccan, the Punjab and the Oude, and take a comparative view of the past and present settlements. The same cry is heard every-

where—the revenue has been increased. The Revenue laws are introduced, modified after a few years and occassionally repealed by the Indian legislature. But is that tantamount to an oppression on the part of the Government of India? The poverty of the Deccan agriculturists is no secret, yet the Government has been trying to ameliorate the condition of the peasants. The settlement began in Bhopal long before the advent of Sir Lepel to the Central India. The people put in objections and they were heard in a regular way; the officials were censured and removed, yet it is said there has been an oppression on the part of the State and I have been identified with it, though I had no hand in the matter. How am I connected with this settlement, which began in the days of the late Secandar Begum, under the supervision of the late Jamaludin, the most distinguished officer in the State, passes beyond my comprehension. At any rate, a charge of this kind in a general way depends, more or less, upon the Revenue Records which Sir Lepel never happened to see. I have reasons to believe that any officer, experienced in the Revenue matters, will not condemn the settlement. I trust that Col. Ward will look into it when he goes on tour and his reports will throw a flood of light on the subject.

Regarding the third charge, it is to be seen that the existence of the Ruler of the State has been totally ignored and the whole administration is said to be in my hands. This is virtually a

charge against the capacity of the Ruler. The various reports, submitted to the Government before the appointment of Sir Lepel at the Indore Residency, are full of tales and fibs and the encomiums, - passed by the Viceroys, are, according to the opinion of Sir Lepel, undeserving, if not false. But Sir Lepel's words carry great weight. In the dispute between the Ruler and her daughter, three distinguished European officers condemned the conduct of the Sultan Jehan Begum, but Sir Lepel turned the table against the Ruler. I believe that the accusation of Sir Lepel on this account against the reigning Begum, has been found to be correct in high quarters. In spite of the repeated assurance of the Ruler, Sir Lepel did not change the idea, which struck deep in his heart, that the Begum was a non-entity. The acts of oppression, as specified by the Agent to the Governor General, have been set forth in Part II sec. I., and separately dealt with. Even supposing for the sake of argument, that I had the sole and exclusive authority in the state matters, the question is how far I have shared in the maladministration. The various reforms, introduced by the Ruler, will shew that they are not engines of oppression. The Police and courts are prominently brought to notice to shew oppression. If the officials, in charge of the two departments, happen to do some unjust or unlawful acts, how can a third person, supposing that he is the superior officer, be charged, until and unless it is

shewn that the subordinates have acted under the orders or instructions of the superior? I have shewn elsewhere how the officials, who were found guilty, had been dealt with by the State. I am afraid Sir Lepel wants to introduce the English laws and procedure in Bhopal, but as the mode of administering justice in British India is expensive, and regarding which I am informed there has been a diversity of opinions, it is highly objectionable to introduce foreign laws and procedure, not adapted to the requirements of the people, in Bhopal. The Police System has been working on for a long time most harmoniously, but as the spies and the enemies of the State can not attain their object on account of the vigilance of the Police, a false representation has been made by those designing men and the Police has been taken to task.

The generality of the officials are old hands and they are the best witnesses to say whether or not I had any influence over them.

Fourth Charge :—

It seems that there have been articles written in the newspapers against Sir Lepel and hence I have been charged to inspire the Editors. If the articles, complained of, are false or defamatory, I understand, the laws, enforced in British India, are adequate enough to bring the offenders to justice. The safest and easiest course open to Sir Lepel was to move the machinery of the criminal courts to sift the matter to the very bottom. A

thorough inquiry in a court of justice will reveal the true state of affairs, and unless it is done there is no chance of removing the suspicions of Sir Lepel. Unfortunately I have not the means to court an inquiry on the subject and it is very difficult for me to prove the negative.

The reasons assigned are, (1) that I intend to wreak full vengeance on the Government for depriving me of my title and salute, (2) that I intend to oppose the new reforms. To direct a measure against the Government is what no sane man will dream of, even if the Government, which graciously raised my dignity by title and salute, has been pleased to divest me of them on the accusations brought against me. I have already incurred the displeasure of the Government of India, and the abject condition, to which I have been reduced, is no secret as it has been proclaimed out to the world. The newspapers want to make a capital out of this. Some have portrayed me in the blackest colours and others have taken different views on the subject. I am fully aware of the evil consequences which may befall me, if I have the hardihood to mix up with the editors in a matter of this kind. I am afraid my emphatic denial to the charge will not be sufficient to convince Sir Lepel of the fact, that I am not in any way connected with the newspapers, but I shall welcome the day when a criminal complaint is lodged against a single newspaper so that all the secrets will ooze out and

I shall be cleared from the charge which has been brought against me on presumptions and probabilities.

It is said that I intend to oppose the reforms, which are introduced in Bhopal by the new minister. I am not surprised to find that my name is connected with this matter by Sir Lepel. I have already said that my accuser has made it a point to connect my name with every thing connected with the Bhopal affairs. I would ask him to say whether the reforms introduced by him, the dismissal and incarceration of the officials under his instructions and the abolition of the old systems under his orders, have met with any opposition. The introduction of the new systems and the silence of the Ruler will speak volumes against the charge; but alas! the mighty pen, which decided the fate of a staunch and faithful ally of the Paramount Power, has been wielded against me and my refutation is but a crying in the wilderness.

If the Paramount Power takes into consideration my antecedents and good deeds, and affords me an opportunity to meet the charges, it will be the highest favor which, under the circumstances, I may crave of the British Government and until and unless it is done I do not find the way to vindicate my conduct and regain the favors which were kindly lavished on me before the advent of Sir Lepel Griffin.

APPENDIX (A.)

The Fatawas (opinions) of Alims (the Mahomedan learned doctors) of India, on the compilation of the following books.

1. THE HIDAYT-US-SAIL.
2. THE TURJAMA WAHABEA.
3. THE IKTRAB-US-SAYA.

The above books are composed or compiled by the Nawob Shaheb of Bhopal. The *Alims* (learned men) in India are asked to refer to the above books, those who have not read them will be good enough to peruse them. The scholars will be good enough to give their impartial opinions on the above books without fear or favor. The following questions with my replies are sent to the learned men in different places in India who will be good enough to state their views.

Question.—Whether the books are seditious or are there any passages hostile to the Government or whether the enemies of the State misinterpreted them to the Government officers.

Opinion.—I have carefully read the books but have not come across any passage inciting *Jehad* against the Government. Not to speak of the *Jehad* against the Government, there is not a stirring passage in favor of *Jehad*.

I. The FIRST BOOK, *Hidayut-us-Sail*, is a collection of maxims. There are eight interrogatories which are quite distinct from *Jehad* but which have been wrongly construed to mean an incitement of *Jehad*. It is a translation of a small Arabic Treatise named *Saef Tabar*, composed by Syed Mahomed, son of Abdool Barry of Yemen. This treatise has been translated by the Nawob with other treatises but it contains no maxim on *Jehad*. The author was considered to be the most learned man in his days and it was sixty or seventy years ago the residents of Yemen

went to him and put the interrogatories regarding the French who were residing at Yemen. The original treatise thus had nothing to do with the British Government and the Nawob has added nothing to the translation in support of the views of the author. The name of the author is referred to and the translation was made twelve or thirteen years ago. To me it appears that the translator is not open to censure, otherwise all editors and proprietors of the newspapers should be held responsible for publishing and quoting the letters on the false Mehdi, Russia &c, the sworn enemies of the Government. If they are not taken to task, why should the Nawob be called upon to submit an explanation ?

II. The SECOND BOOK, *Turjama Wahabea* is a history of the Wahabees taken from the works of the Christian Historians. It exonerates the Indian Mussulmans of the charge of Wahabeeism. In the conclusion of the book, the author has condemned every kind of sedition and disturbance quoting authorities from the *Hadis*. The book shews that the Indian Mussulmans are not Wahabees. The book is decidedly in favor of the British Government.

III. The THIRD BOOK, *Iktrab-us-Saya* proves clearly and forcibly that the Mehdi of Soudan is a false pretender. The object of the book is to keep the illiterate Mahomedans on their guard and to avoid any imposition or inducement by the false claimants. The book speaks of twenty false Mehdies who preceded the Soudan-man but their authority was not accepted by the people. The book in question materially helps the cause of the Government ; those who allege otherwise are either men who have a grudge against the Nawob, or illiterate persons who do not understand the purport of the book. I am prepared to shew from the book itself that the charge is a false one ; and I would refer to the English translation of the *Isat-us-Sunuah* and the Urdu book by the late Moulovie Abdool Barry on the Bhopal affairs ; these deal with the charges brought against each *Khutab*, and passages are quoted therein in support of the views of those

authors. The passages speak clearly of the fact that the object of the book is to support the cause of the Government but it seems that the Government officers have accepted the false representation and the wrong interpretation of the enemies without understanding the true meaning and purport of the passages. I am prepared to vouch the correctness of my statement and to prove before the officers that the book in question is decidedly in favor of the Government. I can shew further that the charges are based on enmity or selfish motive. None can honestly declare that the book purports to incite the people against the Government. I am of opinion that it tends to preserve the harmony between the Rulers and the ruled.

I myself have no connection with the Nawob but I have read his works. The *Mawadul Owaid*, *Rawzata Khasib* and others refute the doctrines of the Wahabees and prove in the present age the non-existence of the requirements and conditions in every country for the declaration of the *Jehad*. I can quote the pages and passages in support of my views. The author is a sincere well-wisher of the Government and is known for his loyalty on various occasions—he who brings a charge against such a man is himself guilty and harbours the sinister idea of breaking the peace of the land.

God is just and knows good and evil !

(Sd.) MAHOMMED SAYED OF BENERAS

Editor of the "Nusroot Soonnah."

In response to the invitation of the Editor of the *Nusroot Soonnah* the following persons gave their opinions in favor of the books and their names are given in the accompanying lists. The opinions of some of the distinguished gentlemen are separately given.

Serial Number.	Names of persons.	Residence.	
1	Ahmed, son of Moulovie Musa	Ahmedpur, Bhawalpur	
2	Abdool Majid Shah	Do	
3	Mahommed Abdool Aziz	Do	
4	Mahommed Ibrahim	Arrah	
5	Wasiat Aly	Do	Teacher
6	Abdool Rahaman	Do	
7	Enayet Ullah	Do	
8	Abdool Wadood	Do	
9	Mahommed Ismail	Do	
10	Mahommed Abdoola	Banat	
11	Abdool Huq	Muzaffernagar	
12	Abdool Kurrim	Do	
13	Syed Mahommed Isaq	Bangalore	
14	Mahommed Sheriff	Do	Manager of
15	Mahommed Abdoola	Akbar	
16	Mahommed Hussein	Mersom	
17	Hafiz Nizamudin	Bombay	
18	Abdad Rahaman	Do	
19	Abdullah Khan	Do	Store-
20	Abdol Razak	Suptdt.	
21	Sheik Abdool Kurrim	Do	
22	Mahommed Abdool Rahim	Do	Captain
23	Gul Mahommed	Do	
24	Rahammt-ullah Khan	Do	
25	Mahommed Khoojah	Do	
26	Hossein Aly	Do	Captain
27	Hisamudin Khan	Do	
28	Mowla Bux	Do	
29	Mahommed Hossein Khan	Do	
30	Hossein Bin Jan Mahommed	Do	
31	Himmat Khan	Do	
32	Haji Hossein Aly	Do	
33	Abdool Rasid	Do	
34	Mahommed Yakub Khan	Do	
35	Kureem Buksh	Do	
36	Ahmedullah Khan	Do	

Serial Number.	Names of persons.	Residence.	
38	Izzut Aly	Bombay	
39	Mahammed Ibrahim	Do	
40	Enayet Ullah	Do	
41	Rahamut Ullah Bin Ahmed Khan	Do	
42	Mahammed Omar	Do	
43	Mahammed Zahirudin	Do	
44	Abdool Kureem	Do	
45	Muzhur Hossein	Do	
46	Mahommed Ysuf	Do	
47	Ahmed Ullah	Do	
48	Abdoollah	Do	
49	Jan Mahommed	Do	
50	Mahommed Asgar	Do	
51	Ramzan	Do	
52	Sheik Abdool Rahaman	Do	
53	Abdoollah	Do	
54	Abbas	Do	
55	Mahommed Hossein	Do	
56	Abdool Kureem	Benares	
57	Mahommed Abdool Raham	Do	
58	Abdool Quabir	Do	
59	Mahommed Ibrahim	Do	
60	Mahommed Selarudin	Do	
61	Mahommed Ismail	Do	
62	Mahommed Ibrahim	Jhung	Teacher
63	Mir Ahmed	Do	Do
64	Ali Mahommed	Do	Do
65	Gholam Russool	Do	
66	Wali Mahommed	Do	
67	Abdool Rahim	Do	
68	Mahommed Ynoos	Jabalpor	
69	Sheik Nusroolah	Do	
70	Asanull-Gunny	Do	
71	Abdool Rouf	Do	
72	Jan Mahommed Khan	Do	
73	Abdool Quaim	Do	
74	Syed Mahommed Nazir Hossein	Delhi	
75	Syed Mahommed Abdool Salem	Do	
76			
77			
78			
79			
80			
81			
82			
83			
84			
85			
86			
87			
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			
94			
95			
96			
97			
98			
99			
100			
101			
102			
103			
104			
105			
106			
107			
108			
109			
110			
111			
112			
113			
114			
115			
116			
117			
118			
119			
120			
121			
122			
123			
124			
125			
126			
127			
128			
129			
130			
131			
132			
133			
134			
135			
136			
137			
138			
139			
140			
141			
142			
143			
144			
145			
146			
147			
148			
149			

Serial Number.	Names of persons.	Residence.	
75	Aboo Mahomed Abdool Huq	Delhi	
76	Abdool Rouf	Do	
77	Mahomed Ysuf	Do	
78	Abool Burkad	Do	
79	Mahomed Abdool Majid	Do	
80	Mahomed Isaq	Do	
81	Abdool Majid Aboo Mahomed Said	Seoni (Chapara)	
82	Abool Barkat	Do	
83	Syed Ahmed Hossein	Ghazipur	Pleader
84	Mahomed Abdoola	Do	Teacher (Arabic Do)
85	Mahomed Abdool Rahamen	Do	
86	Mahomed Abdool Guffur	Do	
87	Ulfut Hossein	Do	
88	Mahomed Zakria	Do	
89	Mahomed Abdoolah	Do	
90	Abdool Kureem	Kurnal	
91	Mahmud	Mooltan	
92	Abdool Hakim	Do	
93	Abdool Tuwab	Do	
94	Burkkoordar	Do	
95	Mahakmoodim	Do	
96	Abdool Guffar	Do	
97	Abdool Manan	Do	
98	Fakir-Ullah	Do	Teacher
99	Kazi Illahi Buksh	Do	
100	Rahim Bux	Do	
101	Noor Mahomed	Mooltan	
102	Mahomed Shah	Do	
103	Mahomed Hisamudin	Mhow, Azimgurh	
104	Sheikh Noor Mahomed	Do	
105	Mahomed Sadullah	Do	
106	Mahomed Khalil Rahaman	Do	
107	Mahomed Aly	Do	
108	Mahomed Abdool Quadir	Do	
109	Syed Mahomed Nizumudin	Nukbee	
110	Kazi Mahomed Abdool	Malapur	
		P.	

Serial Number.	Names of persons.	Residence.	
111	Mahommed Shumsudin Khan	Malapur	
112	Syed Mahommed Fukrudin Nukbee	Do	
113	Abdool Quadir	Do	
114	Mahommed Hossein	Do	
115	Aboo Mahommed Salimullah	Mirzapur	
116	Mahommed Aly	Do	
117	Noor Mahommed	Do	
118	Pana Ullah	Do	
119	Mahommed Isa	Do	
120	Mahommed Abdool Luteef	Do	
121	Mahommed Rufi ullah	Do	
122	Humidullah	Meerat	Teacher
123	Abdool Barry	Do	
124	Hafiz Mahommed Hossein	Do	
125	Abdool Alim	Do	
126	Abdool Samad	Do	
127	Mustapha	Do	
128	Secandar Shah	Do	
129	Abdool Rahaman	Do	
130	Jelaludin	Do	
131	Hafiz Mahommed Shah	Nasirabad	Teacher
132	Ahmed Hossein	Do	
133	Mahommed Habibullah	Do	
134	Mahommed Yakub	Nagpur	Soobadar Major Govt Pensioner
135	Do	Do	Do
136	Mahommed Abdool Aziz	Do	Teacher
137	Abdool Kureem	Do	
138	Syed Abdool Rahaman	Do	
139	Sheik Omar	Do	
140	Sheik Ibrahim	Do	
141	Mahommed Osman Khan	Do	Propictor of a news- paper
142	Abdool Majid	Do	
143	Mahommed Jehangir Khan	Do	Editor of Kyan Nag-

Serial Number.	Names of persons.	Residence.	
145	Moulovie Abdool Rahim Khan	Nagpur	
146	Abdool Rahim	Do	Forest Department
147	Dilawor Khan	Do	
148	Mahammed Ibrahim	Do	
149	Mahammed Ismail	Do	
150	Abdool Munnah	Wazirabad	
151	Mahammed Abdool Jubbar	Omerpor	
152	Sheik Hossein	Allahpur	
153	Abdool Rahim	Do	Soobadar
154	Mahammed Jamal	Do	Major.
155	Gholam Dustgir	Do	Do
156	Syed Shahabudin	Do	
157	Sheik Salar	Do	
158	Hakim Abdool Quadir	Do	
159	Omor Khan	Do	
160	Mahammed Yakub	Do	
161	Mahammed Ismail	Do	
162	Syed Mahi-u-din	Do	Pensioner
163	Mahammed Khan	Do	
164	Mahammed Ghous	Do	
165	Mahammed Hossein	Do	
166	Syed Ibrahim	Do	
167	Syed Sultan	Do	
168	Mahammed Kasim	Do	
169	Abdool Rahaman	Do	
170	Mahammed Yakub	Do	
171	Sheik Mahiudin		

We confidently know that the Nawob of Bhopal, especially the followers of *Hadis* and generally the Ahl Hadis consider it a sin to declare Jehad against the Government in the absence of the requirements. His works proclaim loudly that the result of the Jehad is not favorable in this and future world. The *Hidayut-us-Sail* and the *Turjama Wahabea* do not incite the people to Jehad according to the requirements of the *Shura*. Those who say otherwise are either liars or enemies. The *Mawadul Obeid* and the *Rowz-i-Khasib* forbid strictly Jehad, rebellion and disturbance.

(Sd.) 1. AHMED BIN.

(Sd.) 2. FAKIR ABDOOL MAJID SHAH.

(Sd.) 3. MOHAMMED ABDOOL AZIZ.

I have seen the *Turjama Wahabea*, *Hidayut-us-Sail*, *Ifrab-us-Saya* from the beginning to the end but could not find therein, any maxim against the Sunnat and Jammat sects. The opinion of the Nawob, on Jehad, is not unlike that of the Theologues who preceded him. There is nothing of Jehad against the British Government, but on the other hand he has assigned many reasons for the non-existence of the requirements of Jehad in the present days in his own works. The Mehdi of Soudan is represented to be a rebel and his claims have been shewn to be false. I wonder at the ideas and thoughts of those who have misrepresented to the officers ; these men have no faith in futurity and unnecessarily trouble others. The British Government is not like its predecessors who used to put men in trouble, on the false informations supplied to them ; it is famous for its administration of justice even to hair splitting. These unbelievers who made false representations would, sooner or later, be found out by the British Government after due investigation (an investi-

gation should be made) ; these liars and tale-carriers should be called upon to prove their allegations.

In other points I concur with the Benaras gentleman.

(Sd). SYED MAHOMMED.

FUKIRUDIN NUQUEY.

No. III.

I am not a servant of the Nawob nor have I any connection with the Bhopal State. My statement herein-after given is, to the best of my belief, just and fair.

Within the last twenty five years I have read the smaller and larger works of the Nawob, in the Urdu, Persian and Arabic languages, and especially the *Hidayat-us-Saya*, the *Iftral u-Saya*, the *Turjama-Wahabea* and the *HUJJUL-KARAMA*. I have read the latter works most scrutinisingly, to find out a passage directed against the British Government. I have come to conclusion after critical examination of the books, there is nothing against the Government but on the other hand the object of the compiler is to remove at once all the disaffected thoughts and ideas of the subjects and to prevail upon them to believe sincerely that it is their bounden religious duty to avoid the disturbance against the Government. The compilations have brought on this result in the Carnatic, and thousands of men cry aloud sincerely that it is a serious evil to be hostile to or rebel against the Government and it is not warranted by the faith of Islam. There is not a sentence or passage in the Khutab in question, which suggests to any man of common sense that it is against the Government. May God save from the evils. This is a false charge against the Nawob. Under the mandates of my religion I concur with the views of the Benaras gentleman and add that they are just and correct.

(Sd.) SYED MAHOMMED.

NIZAMUDIN NUKBEE.

Malapur.

Carnatic.

No. IV.

As far as I have seen the writings of the Nawob, there is no passage against Islam or the Government ; but the enemies have invented the story and taken us aback. They have misrepresented to the officers. * * * * * If carefully read it will appear how cleverly the enemies have managed. It is just like picking up an isolated sentence from the Koran "*Yah aishul lusi a munnla takroo bus Salata*" (Ye who accepted faith approach not near the prayer). The words which follow the above sentence are "when ye are drunk."

(Sd.) ABDoola KHAN.

Bombay.

V.

The Government of India is great ; when I consider of the justice of the Government, it seems that the charges are unfounded and it is needless for one to clear himself. The treatises in question are as clear as broad noonday and there is nothing of Jehad mentioned therein. Is any proof wanted ? Let the Government read and examine the books and discriminate right from wrong and find out the nature and character of the persons who have brought the charges.

(Sd.) AHMEDULLAH.

No. VI.

I have carefully read the books in question. I can confidently state without fear or favor that there is no passage in the book which is adverse to the Goverment, directly or indirectly, or which incites the subjects against the Government, but on the other hand it is fair and just to say that the Nawob has checked the Mussalmans on religious grounds from sedition and mutiny and has frightened the rebels. The Nawob has shewn that the mutiny in 1857 was a mere disturbance caused not by Jehad, and that the Mehdi of Soudan is a false pretender strongly condemning his war. This is not my

invention. Let any one read the Koran and the Hadis and compare them with the treatises of the Nawob and test the correctness of my views. I shall be responsible if my view is not correct.

(Sd.) MAHOMED YANIS

Jubbalpore.

VII.

I concur with the Editor of the *Nursool-Soonah*. It is true that the Nawob has not expressed his own views in the books but has compiled the authoritative khutabs. It is wrong and unjust to say that the books are adverse to the Government, but on the other hand they are in support of the cause of the Government *vide* pages, 7, 47, 55 of the *Iktrab-us-Saya* which shew that there is no necessity of Jehad in India under the present regime, as each administration and the Empress of India govern the land under impartial laws in protection of our creed. The religious toleration and freedom are allowed to the subjects under enactments, hence it is prohibited to declare Jehad against the present Rulers. At pp. 130 to 134, India has been put under the category of *Darul Islam* in the *Hidayut-us-Saya*. In short all the works of the Nawob which I have read are free from any sedition and that a false charge has been brought against him.

(Sd.) SYED AHMED HOSSEIN

Plaider Ghazipur.

No. VIII.

I have read the three books referred to in the questions. I have not come across any passage declaring Jehad or creating disturbance against the Government; but on the other hand the books seem to be against such views. The author totally denies the existence of the requirements of the Jehad and hence he has strongly condemned it, on the score of its being a cause of disturbance and fight. This I can clearly shew from the

books. Any just man, who has the sense to understand the books, will not think that the books are meant against the Government. To me it seems that those who have misrepresented to the Government are either illiterate or inimical to the Government, the subjects and the author with the object of destroying the peace of the land and inflicting troubles on the Government officers and the subjects.

(Sd.) MAHOMMED ABDOOLA

Head Teacher (Arabic)

Ghazipur.

No. IX.

The books compiled by the Nawob do not contain any passage against the British Government but on the other hand the writings encourage loyalty, devotion and faithfulness to the Government. Let any one read the books and see whether I am correct.

(Sd.) MAHOMMED OBEDULLAH.

(Seal)

Banat, District Muzaffornagar.

No. X.

I think confidently that the books of the Nawob Shaheb do not contain any passage against the British Government nor the Nawob has been or will be disloyal to the Government. The Nawob has compiled the maxims of the Saunat without any fear or favor, for which the followers of Islam other than *Ahl Hadis* have brought false charges. If justly considered the Nawob will stand free of the charges and the enmity of the false accusers will be proved.

(Sd.) ABDOOL KURRIM.

No. XI.

I have read the theological works of the Nawob which are an exposition of the Hadis (the creed of the Sunnat) and form a refutation of the counter creeds. Hence the enemies have taken umbrage and without carefully understanding the passages have picked up a few sentences to shew the hostile attitude of the Nawob towards the British Government. If the whole passage had been taken into consideration they could not have construed the meaning as they have done. The three books do not contain any passage against the British Government but on the other hand there are passages clearly forbidding Jehad against the Goverment and encouraging loyalty.

(Sd.) SYED MAHOMMED ISA,

Banat, Muzuffernagar.

No. XII.

I have read the works of the Nawob and especially the three books. There is not a single word which speaks against the Government directly or indirectly. They have nothing to do with the British Government ; if they have, it is to this extent that the cause of the Government is supported on religious grounds. The object of the Nawob is to spread the religion of the Sunnats. Those who think that the Khutabs are hostile to the Government are murderers of truth and hence it clearly appears that they are the enemies of the Nawob. If I express my opinion fully I must concur with the views of Moulvie Mahammed Syed, the editor of the *Narsul-o-Soonna*. Briefly speaking I must concur with his opinion.

(Sd.) MAHOMMED SHEREEF

Proprietor of Akka Mansoory.

APPENDIX (B).

An "Extract from the supplememnt to the "advocate of India" (a Bombay Journal) in support of my explanation to the charges brought by Sir Lepel Griffin regarding the books.

" An Extract "

" * * * * * We now intend to refer to the charges which have been brought against the Nabob, and which, in the opinion of his opponents, constitute a sufficient justification for a severe form of punishment.

These charges are :—

(1).— * * * * *

(2).—That he (the Nabob) sent money to the Mehdi through one Din Mohamed.

(3).—That he wrote the Majmua-i-Khutab, the Hidayat-us-Sail, the Tarjaman Wahabiya, the Iqtrab-us-Sait, and other works against the British Government* in order to incite the people to wage Jihad or religious war against Government.

* * * * * We now proceed to refute the several charges in the order in which we have stated them.

(1).— * * * * *

(2) Similarly, the statement about the Nabob Consort sending money to the Mehdi through one Din Mahammad is entirely imaginary. In order to give it a coloring of truth, the Mashir-i-Qaisar † state that "if Din Mahommad had not been cleverly made to escape to Cabul he would have been

* Vide Alim-ul-Akhbar of Calcutta 1st March, 1886.

† Vide Mashir-i-Qaisar, 4th February, 1886.

been assuredly punished." We are glad to be able to inform our contemporary that the Din Muhammad to whom he refers was arrested at Lahore a few days ago and that he is taking his trial. Let our contemporary therefore come forward on the present occasion, and prove the complicity of the Nabob Consort in the case under notice, and get him adequately punished. We beg to assure the Mashir that we shall be glad to assist him in order to see the enemies of our benign Government adequately punished. The statement * made by Din Muhammad in court shows that so far from being a confidential agent, he is a deadly enemy of the Nabob. Self-constituted councillors like our contemporary are of course at liberty to extort ~~any~~ confession they like out of him prejudicial to the Nabob, but they must, always remember that the † antecedents of Din Muhammad and his

* We have learnt on good authority that Din Mohamed made a statement in the Court of the Judicial Assistant, Lahore, to the effect that he had been sent to Lahore by Sir Lepel Griffin, in order to collect some evidence against the Nawab. Sir Lepel Griffin, who was telegraphed to, has not confirmed this statement, but it is clear from Din Mohamed's confession that he is an enemy of the Nabob and not his confidential agent.

† Din Mohamed is a resident of Bhopal. Originally a Hindu of the Kalal caste, he became a Mohamedan and entered the service of the late Qudsiya Begum, whose hostility to the Nabob consort and the Begum has been admitted even by our contemporaries. He has been in the habit of extorting money by threatening people to report them to the authorities and representing himself as a spy. He had also obtained money on other pretences as is clear from an advertisement in the Nusratus-sun-nat warning people against his machinations and stating that he left Benares after obtaining money on false pretences. On one occasion he tried to extort money out of the Nabob by writing a petition in which he asked the latter to pay him a thousand rupees, else he would write to Sir Lepel Griffin that he had been sent by the Nawab with a thousand rupees to the Mehdhi and that he had declined to pay the other thousand rupees which he had promised. The Nabob sent this petition to the Criminal Court which punished him after duly inquiring into the case. He was also punished on a previous occasion for a similar offence. This can be verified from the misals of the Bhopal Court. He confessed that he had threatened the Nabob because he did not provide for him after the death of Qudsiya Begum. These facts show clearly enough that he is an open enemy of the Nabob and that consequently any statement he might invent for his own safety or at the instance of others cannot be relied on if the misals of the Bhopal Courts are to be trusted.

cases in the courts of Bhopal render his evidence against the Nawob legally worthless. Of course, if it is politically expedient to receive his evidence, then it is a different thing altogether.

(3).—The third charge which our Mahomedan brethren have preferred against the Nabob is only partially true but mostly unfounded. That the works of the Nawob contain some passages to which exception might be taken, is true enough, but to credit him with being the author of those passages and to infer from them that he is an enemy of the British Government is monstrous. These passages have been *quoted* in the Nawob's works from other authors. Indeed, the Nawob's works contain passages diametrically opposed to those to which exception has been taken.

Secondly, the meaning of most of the passages has been purposely distorted to show the Nabob as being disloyal to the British Government, although they really do not at all show that the Nawob is in any way hostile to the Government.

Thirdly, the authorship of certain passages has been wrongly ascribed to the Nawob—passages which are conspicuous by their absence in his writing.

We now proceed to refute the several misrepresentations of which the Nawab Consort has been made the victim by his opponents, and trust that our benign Government and its officials, who may have been misled by such misrepresentations, will carefully consider what we have to say on the subject.

The *first work* in which Siddiq Hassan Khan is charged with attempting to incite people to wage war against Government is the Dewan Khutáb or Moizat-i-Hasna. The opponents of the Nawab have tried to impress on the Government and some of the officials that in the work in question the Nawab has attempted to excite the people to Jehad, and has purposely compiled it in the Arabic language and printed it in Egypt so as to create a feeling of hostility against the Government in Arabia and Egypt. It is true that this work contains a Khutba on the question of Jehad ; but it is wrong to say that the Nawab is the author of that Khutba.

or that it is intended to incite people to Jehad, or that he wrote it in the Arabic language and printed it in Egypt in order to excite the Arabs and Egyptians against the Government.

The fact is that the several Khutbas contained in the book are not written by one and the same author, but by various authors ; and the one dealing with Jehad is from the pen of Moulovi Mohammad Ismail, the martyr, who wrote it when he was engaged in a religious war against the Sikhs, on account of the latter interfering with the Mahammedans in the performance of their religious duties. He did not wage a religious war against the British, nor did he excite people against them in the Khutba in question. Indeed, he considered it unlawful to wage war against them, and this he declared openly in Calcutta (*vide* Syad Ahmad Khan's reply to Dr. Hunter, which he quoted at page 7 of the last number of the *Ishat-us-Sunah*).

The Nawab, according to an ancient custom, collected, the Khutbas of the Ulema, including that of Moulovi Ismail on Jehad, and caused the collection to be printed in India. As the question of Jehad (which is enjoined under certain circumstances which do not exist) is referred to in almost all Mahammedan books on Theology and the traditions of the Prophet, and as in the Khutba under notice the people are not called upon to wage Jehad against the Government, he very rightly considered that the publication of this Khutba,* or the book containing it, would do no harm to the British Government.

But the mere mention of the word Jehad was considered sufficient by the opponents of the Nawab, who at once succeeded in rousing the suspicions of certain officials against him. Accordingly, on the 21st March 1881, Colonel Bannermann, Political Agent, Saihoor (Bhopal territory), raised certain objections against the work in question, whereupon the Nawab destroyed all the copies he could lay his hands upon in the presence of the Political Agent. When this work was republished in Egypt, the

* We have a copy of the first edition containing the Khutba on Jehad, and we shall be glad to show it to anybody who may be inclined to verify our statement.

Khutba of Moulovi Mohammad Ismail was excluded. We have a copy of the edition published in Egypt with us, and shall be glad to show it to any one who may desire to verify our statement.

This shows that the Nawab, so far from attempting to excite people to wage Jehad against the British, is loyal to the British Government. Indeed, if the object of the Nawab had been to excite people against the Government, he should have published this work or the Khutba on Jehad in the Vernacular and not in the Arabic language, which not one out of a hundred Indian Mahammedans understand. On the other hand, if he had meant to create ill-feeling against them in Egypt and Arabia he should not have excluded the Khutba on Jehad. The publication in Arabic in India, and the omission of the Khutba on Jehad in the Egyptian edition, prove conclusively that he did not mean to excite the people to Jehad.

The remarks we have made above will, we trust, serve to convince our readers that the Nawab Consort cannot be charged with attempting to excite people to Jehad on account of the publication of the *Dewan-i-Khutab*.

The *second work* which the Nawab is represented as having published with the same object, *viz.*, to excite the people to Jehad, is the *Hidayat-us-Sail*. The Nawab's opponents have tried to impress on the Government that on pages 88 to 91 of this work the Nawab calls upon the Arabs either to expel the English from Arabia, or to massacre them, or convert them to Islam; and that at pages 94 to 104 the Nawab, in replying to certain questions, proves that India is "a *Dar-ul-Harb*, or place of war, that it is the duty of the Mahammedans to rescue by the sword from the hands of infidels all cities occupied by the latter;" and that it is unlawful (*kufr*) for the Muhammadans to reside in the cities of infidels, or to serve them, or cultivate their friendship, or to call their laws just, and so on. It is no doubt true that the *Hidayat-us-Sail* does contain such passages; but it is not true that the Nawab

is their author, or that his object in publishing them was to create ill-feeling or hostility against the English. The passages in question are written by others, the Nawab having simply quoted them.

The first passage which is quoted at pages 88 to 91 is a translation of Hassan-bin-Jalal of Yemen's treatise called the Banian, as stated on page 91, line 10, of the Hidayat-us-Sail. The remaining passages which appear on pages 94 to 104 are literal translations of a treatise called Saif Tabbar written by Sayed Abdul Barri of Yemen. Although no reference has been made to this treatise in the Hidayat-us-Sail, but in another work, the Ibrat, which was published by the Nawab three years later, in A. H. 1294, the text of the treatise and its name are given. We have both of these treatises (Banian and Saif Tabbar) at our disposal, and we can show them to any one who cares to see them. The fact of the Nawab translating and quoting from these treatises in the Hidayat-us-Sail without expressing any opinion, favourable or otherwise, is just like the reproducing (by the newspaper critics of the Nawab) of the Mehdi's proclamations or the hostile actions of Russia against the Government without any comment. Such an act cannot be regarded in the light of an attempt at inciting the people to rebellion; so far as our own experience goes, we can conscientiously assert that the object of the Nawab in reproducing such passages was to show his profound learning and research, and not for the purpose of showing his friendship or hostility to the British Government * * * * It is not true that he inserted them for the purposes of exciting the people to rebellion. In support of this assertion we will adduce an argument the soundness of which will be admitted by all unprejudiced minds, and that is that in the Hidayat-us-Sail and subsequent works the Nawab also inserted the following *masails* (maxims), which are diametrically opposed to those to which exception has been taken.

(1). That the cities of India are Dar-ul-Islam (places of

safety) and not Dar-ul-Harb (places of war) (thus contradicting all the passages quoted on pages 94 to 104 of the Hidayat-us-Sail).

(2). That the chiefs and people of India having entered into a treaty of friendship with the British Government, it is unlawful for any person to wage religious war against the British or to break the treaty.

(3). That the Mutiny of 1857 was not a Jehad but a rebellion.

(4). That it is unlawful to entertain any hostility towards the Government even for those (while residing in this country) who consider India a Dar-ul-Harb (or place of war).

(5). That the circumstances which would justify Jehad do not exist in India, and that no person from Calcutta to Peshawar and from Sindh to the Deccan may wage Jehad against the British Government.

(6). That the British Government is just and desirous of maintaining public tranquility, and so on

On page 130 of the Hidayat-us-Sail the author asks the question (44), Whether the Mahammedan States in India, like Hyderabad and Bhopal, &c., are Dar-ul-Islam (places of safety) or Dar-ul Harb, and then shows that these States and all other cities in India are Dar-ul-Islam and not Dar-ul-Harb. After quoting some passages from works on Theology in support of his assertion, he sums up as follows on page 133:—

“As India generally and the Mahammedan states in particular are not Dar-ul-Harb according to Imam Aazum, therefore *hijrat* from this country is also unlawful, and according to the learned men of Delhi, Rampur, Bhopal, this country and especially the Mahammedan states are Dar-ul Islams.”

At page 40 of the Muwaqidul-awaid, after quoting at length the traditions prohibiting rebellion, the Nawab says:—

“In fine, to fulfil one's promises and carry out the contract be they new or old, with integrity, is the guiding principle of Islam. It is for this reason that when kings and rulers of the Islamic faith, possessed of wealth and power, enter into

a treaty of peace with any Government, they heartily respect and observe the terms of it to their dying moment ; and consider the violation of it a great sin, opposed to the spirit of Islam.

When any Mahammedian ruler concludes a compact with any Government, his subjects are understood to be included in the same, and bound to think themselves responsible for carrying out the terms, although nothing may have been said of them at the time of the agreement. Because when the prince of a State contracts with a *Hakim* for the time being, he does so on behalf of all his subjects and not for his own private self. In a word, the agreement may be looked upon as one entered into by the subjects.

It is a fact well known to every one that during the Sepoy Mutiny, when the whole native army rebelled against the British Government and began to commit as much mischief and cruelty as it could, the native Chiefs that respected their covenant did not prove faithless, but remained firm in their allegiance to the Paramount power.

But those who acted against their plighted faith, besides making themselves notorious in the eyes of the British officials, acted against the principles and practices of *Islam*.

One who is insincere and violates his promises, is according to his own religion, looked upon as having committed a great sin, and to what punishment is such a man to be ultimately doomed, will be perfectly known on the Day of Judgment. In short, such a man is a loser in this as well as in the world to come.

When the laws of Mahomed enjoin the fulfilment of our promises during the whole term of a treaty, it is incumbent upon every native Prince or Chief to observe the same till the period of its close, and faithfully carry it out without a thought of violating it.

It is well known that the agreements and treaties with their several articles and propositions detailed in each treaty entered

into by the Native Princes with the British Government, are binding upon the former in the order of descent and generation after generation. All native rulers should not, therefore, depart even a hair's breadth from their treaties, in order that they may be free from the stigma of faithlessness and insincerity in this world, and that of shame and disgrace in the next."

And again at page 34 of the same work the writer observes—

“The recompense of Jehad, the virtues of which are contained in the Koran, can be obtained only when all the causes and conditions, for undertaking a Jehad, exist according to the Shara.

The Mahammedan public now-a-days, for the most part possessing no sense or learning, and more prominently those endowed with wealth and authority among them, have misunderstood sedition for Jehad. No one possessing an idea of sense and learning can support or acknowledge their misguided zeal. Accordingly, in the year of the Mutiny, some of the Indian Rajas, Babus, Nawabs and Nobles, made India the hot-bed of disorder, strife and commotion, in the name of Jehad. This spirit, of revolt and open resistance raged so high in them that even women and children, whom every Shariat protects from massacre, were made the innocent victims of their bloody swords. Now this act of theirs is regarded by every Mahammedan as quite opposed to the laws of Mohamed and is never justifiable in any sect of Islam. Any one fomenting such a sedition at the present day is as much guilty as the rebels of 1857. The Mahammedan theologians are not at one with regard to the proposition whether India is a Dar-ul-Harb or a Dar-ul-Islam, since the advent of the English rule. Those of the Hanafia church, to which the Indian Musalman mostly belong, unanimously assert that India is a Dar-ul-Islam. When India is so regarded Jehad can have no meaning here. In fact it is a great sin.

Even with such Mahammedan doctors, inclusive of some of those at Delhi, who think that this country is a Dar-ul-Harb ;

as long as we do not abandon the country and settle in another, where Islam prevails, *Jehad* is not justified.

In short, to live in a *Dar-ul-harb* and wage *Jehad* in it, is on no account justifiable, either in the eyes of the ancient or the modern Musalmans.

Besides the principal condition for *Jehad* is to be the follower of such an *Imam** as combines in himself wisdom, learning, justice, acuteness of intellect, and a penetrating judgment and possesses all the attributes of a spiritual guide. The wise, sensible, and experienced portion of the population must approve of his *Imamat*.

The women and the children, the old and the infirm, must not be put to death. If any person other than the true *Imam* claim his office, he must be put to the sword as rebellious. The above conditions were all absent during the mutiny as well as at present.

In short, to think of waging *Jehad* in India at the present day on the basis of the Mahammedan laws, is nothing but madness."

At page 187 of the *Rowz-i-Khutkhusib* it is stated. "It may be affirmed with perfect certainty that at the present moment there is not a single man from Calcutta to Peshawar, and from Sindh to the Deccan who believes that *Jehad* against the British is lawful, because the conditions which would justify it do not exist, and it seems difficult that they should come into existence at the present moment."

In the *Tarjman Wahabia*, which is represented as being a proof of the Nawab's disloyalty, the writer, after referring to the treatises written by Nawab Abdul Latif Khan, C. I.E., and himself, and proving by quotations from them that India is not a *Dar-ul-Harb*, makes the following remarks on page 72:—

According to the *Hanafia* creed, I have represented India as *Dar-ul-Islam* in several of my publications, and mentioned

* One of these is that he should be a Koreish, an attribute which no present Muhammedan ruler can boast of.

in them the absence in this country of the conditions for *Jehad*, a fact alluded to in the '*Terahwin Sadi*.' The book containing the expression of my views was published before I had the knowledge of the discussion that had arisen in Calcutta on the subject, which Maulvi Abdul Latif Khan Bahadur took so much pains in, and which, subsequently, led to the publication of a criticism by Syed Ahmad Khan Bahadur, C.S.I., on Dr. Hunter's book.

There has never been any religious discussion in any of the sects at Bhopal ; and consequently the officials of this State have had no knowledge of the religious disputes prevailing in other towns and no desire to read such books.

On the other hand, in the year 1298 A. H., owing to a political necessity, I read the criticisms and the newspaper alluded to above, because I found the statements therein contained just in keeping with the principles of Moslems in general and those of the *Ahl-i-Hadis* in particular."

"Similarly in a work entitled the *Ibrat*, and written during the Russo-Turkish war, on the doctrines of *Jehad* and *Hijrat* (or flight), the conditions stated as necessary for *Jehad* are such as do not exist at the present moment, while in the *Iklil* I quote, as an instance, from Qazi Mohamed *bin* Ali Shaukani (my master) that the least qualification (of justice) for an *Imam* should be, that he should exert himself for the public good and for the maintenance of peace and order like the British Government." Further on, at page 73, the author remarks : "and also the charge of Wahabeeism or *Jehad* against the *Ulemas* of the *Ahl-i-Hadis* sect, whether of ancient times or of the present day, is without foundation. No intelligent man, with the exception of half-read *Mullahs*, can for a moment assert that it is lawful to wage *Jehad* against the British Government, or that the conditions which would justify it exist at the present moment." And again, at page 79, he says :—

"As Syed Ahmad Khan Bahadur has discussed the question of *Jehad* in his reply to Dr. Hunter, so I had, before the

knowledge of this fact, denied Wahabeism altogether, *first*, in my work called *Hidayat-us-Sail*; and *secondly*, in another entitled *Rauz-i-Khasaib*. *Thirdly*, in my work known as *Mawaid-ul-Awaid*, I had mentioned that to violate one's promise was an egregious sin and that *Jehad* was not lawful in Hindustan. *Fourthly*, I had written in my work entitled *Táj-i-Mokollal* an account of the Wahabis from the histories of Christian divines. The gist of them all is, that the rising of the people during the Indian Mutiny is termed *Jehad* only by those who are unacquainted with the origin of the Islamic faith, and who wish to cause disorder in the country and destroy the prevailing peace.

As long as an *Imam* of the Koresh family and no other, possessing all the attributes enjoined in the *Shara*, is not selected with the unanimous consent of the wise and the principal men of a country,—an *Imam* whom they think it their bounden duty to obey,—and all the conditions for levying *Jezzias*, and pressing people to become Musalmans do not exist, so long *Jehad* is impossible. Such an *Imam* has not been found in the world for hundreds of years, and the conditions of *Jehad* have always been wanting. The mere existence of the *masala* of *Jehad* with the non-existence of its conditions, in the books of *Islam* does not make any Musalman a *Jehadi*, a Wahabi, or a rebel.”

Similar passages are to be found in other works of the Nawab which we are unable to quote for want of space. The passages already quoted are sufficient to convince any person (unless he is prejudiced against the Nawab and the Ahl-i-Hadis) that the object of the author in quoting doctrines and passages which imply hostility against the British Government was not to excite the people to rebellion against the British. Nor can it be asserted that the Nawab believed in such doctrines, as in that case he would not have so often and so earnestly refuted them. Nor would he have in the *Hidayat-us-Sail* itself and other works, published in Arabic, Persian, and Urdu, inserted

passages in which loyalty to the British Government is enjoined and hostility towards them is prohibited. Indeed, he would not have taken the trouble of removing the impression of hostility with so much force.

The passages which we have quoted from his own writings show beyond all doubt that he does not believe in doctrines which he has quoted in his works from other authors. On the contrary, his own belief is apparent from the opinions he has expressed from time to time. It is also clear that the Nawab did not quote these passages with a view to inciting the people to rebellion, but in order to show his universal knowledge of every doctrine without reference to its correctness or otherwise. * * * * * on page 139 of the Al-ibra-
fi-Masail-il-Jihad-wal-Hijrat which we take the liberty of quoting in support of our assertion. After quoting the opinions of various Theologians and Muhadises as to whether India is a Dar-ul-Harb or Dar-ul-Islam, the author says :—

“ In my opinion the point is a doubtful one and no decisive or satisfactory answer is to be found. It is for this reason that I have, as a follower of the Hanfi sect, stated in the Hidayat-us-Sail, India to be a Dar-ul-Islam, while elsewhere according to the Muhadises (of Delhi whose opinions have been quoted and not all the Muhadises,) India has been represented as Dar-ul-Kufr (place of infidelity). In this work I have collected all the opinions without expressing my own opinion as to the correctness of any one of them.”

The passage quoted clearly shows that the Nawab is not in the habit of inquiring into the correctness of the opinions of other writers whom he quotes. On the contrary he is in the habit of quoting opinions opposed to his own belief. Under these circumstances, the fact of his copying certain doctrines from the Banian and Saif-i-Tabar does not at all warrant the conclusion that he is a rebel. * * * * *

The correspondent of the Alim-ul-Akhbar of Calcutta in its issue of the 1st March 1886, commenting on those passages

of the Nawab's works which prove his steadfast loyalty to the British, says that the works were written only through fear of the authorities, and that it was after the fact of his writing works for inciting people and publishing them in India, Turkey and Arabia, had been brought to the notice of the Government by General Daly and others, that the Nawab set himself to the task of refuting his previous writings and asked his co-religionists at Bhopal, Agra and Lahore (by Lahore the writer evidently means the Ishat-us-Sunnah) to denounce Jihad.

The writer, according to a well-known proverb that "a liar has no memory," further on contradicts himself and says that the Nawab wrote and induced his friends to write in favor of the British because he knew ten years ago that he should be punished for his previous writings.

We have already referred to the correspondent of the Seraj-ul-Akhbar of Jhelum who says that the Ahl-i-Hadis denounce Jihad merely to please the Government, but that they really consider it their duty to wage war against the British. According to him the passages quoted from the Banian and Saif-i-Tabbar in the Hidayat-us-Sail, faithfully reflect the views of the Nawab, while the passages, we have quoted above, do not actually represent the Nawab's views on the subject and in support of his view he mentions the fact of Maulvi Ismail undertaking a Jihad.

We consider it necessary to refute the misrepresentations and mischievous charges preferred by these critics. The assertions of the first named critic that the works the Nawab inculcating Jihad were mostly printed in Turkey and Arabia and a smaller number in India is a barefaced lie. Of all the works published in Turkey, Arabia and Egypt,* not one incul-

* The following are the works which the proprietor of the Al-Juwaib for his benefit and not at the instance of the Nawab published in Turkey:—Bulgh (a Dictionary) Lughatul Islam (History) Naswatus Sukram (Literature) Alamul Khafaq (Derivation of words).

The following are the works printed in Egypt:—Fath-ul-Bari (Hadis) Fateh-ul-Byan (commentary) Nuzul-ul-Abtar (prayers) Nail-ul-Auturr (Hadis) Khulasa Asma-ul-rijel (Annals) Wasaya Ibn Arabi (Sufi-ism) Rosala Basharat Amal Salih (moral science) Ahkam-i-Musturat (rights of women, &c.) Rouz-i-Nadiya (Hadis).

cates Jehad against the English. If the writer has the slightest regard for truth or has any sense of honor he should come forward and point out at least one of the books in which Jehad against the English is inculcated. The statement, that the Nawab wrote against Jehad, only when the matter was brought to the notice of the Government, by General Daly, is also incorrect. The fact is, that Government expressed their objections through General Daly or Colonel Bannerman to the Khutba on Jehad merely, and not to the passages in the Hidayat-us-Sail, and it was for this reason that the apology he tendered for the publication of the Khutba on Jehad did not include the Hidayat-us-Sail (21st March 1881). This is clear from an official document in which it is stated, that, "the Government had no knowledge of the existence of the Hidayat-us-Sail in 1881." These facts prove, beyond doubt, that the assertion of the writer, that the Nawab contradicted the Hidayat-us-Sail, *after* the matter was brought to the notice of the Government has no foundation whatever to rest upon. Secondly, even if it is true, it reflects credit rather than discredit on the Nawab, and proves his loyalty, inasmuch as he refuted those passages the moment he came to know that the Government took exception to them. Previously, he did not consider that the passages in question would do any harm to Government and inserted them in his works through ignorance. Thus in a manner the Nawab changed his attitude when he found that these passages were considered hostile, and made ample amends for any harm he might have unconsciously done. To denounce such commendable action and misrepresent an act of loyalty as one of rebellion is to deliberately mislead the public.

* * * * The statement that the Nawab began to write against Jehad, because he was ten years ago sure of the punishment which he has now received, is falsified by his own previous statement. Our remarks in refutation of the first assertion of this writer are equally applicable to his second

statement. Another argument the soundness of which will not be questioned by any unprejudiced mind may also be adduced to show that the writer's last statement is false. The passages, which in the opinion of this critic, the Nawab knew would cost him his title, &c., and to avert which calamity he took to denouncing Jehad, are reproduced in the Ibra, published three years after the Hidayat-us-Sail in 1294 A. H. Surely, if the Nawab had known that those passages would do any harm to the Government, he would not have reproduced them in a later work. It is simply impossible, that the Nawab, who had for the past ten years been trying to remove the impression of disloyalty, should have, *three years later* so far gone out of his way as to repeat what he knew, would result in his present disgrace. On the contrary, the fact of his reproducing the passages under notice, so far from his attempting to ward off the punishment which he believed awaited him, shows clearly that he did not consider these passages injurious to the Government. * * * *

In reply to the correspondent of the Serajul Akhbar, we need not say more than that, if it is right to ascribe an action to bad motives, notwithstanding that it could be attributed to good faith, the Ahl-i-Hadis can assert with regard not only to the writer, but also his and every other newspaper, edited by Hanfis, that their professions of loyalty to Government are empty phrases signifying nothing, and that they are at heart the enemies of the British Government, and cordially wish for the downfall of their rule. Should the Government (God forbid) find itself compelled to fight against any Mahamedan power, and especially the Sultan of Turkey, whom they regard as their lawful Caliph and in whose name the Khutba is read on every Friday and on the Eed festivals, the Hanfis would, one and all, rebel against the Government and aid its enemies. The Hanfis can refute this assertion by exactly the same arguments as the Nawab and if we were inclined to give a "tit for a tat" it would be necessary for us to give a

detailed account of the Mutiny of 1857 and mention the Maulvies and Khans who were the cause of the Mutiny, and who one and all belonged to the same sect as the critics of the Nawab, to the entire exclusion of the Ahl-i-Hadis, so as to convince these calumniators of Siddiq Hasan Khan that the suspicion against the Ahl-i-Hadis is purely imaginary, while the same charge can not only be preferred but proved against them by undeniable facts. We, however, as journalists, feel ashamed to have recourse to any such alternative, and will simply content ourselves with praying that the Almighty may be pleased to endow our opponents with a sense of shame which they evidently seem to be utterly devoid of, so that they may refrain from giving publicity to seditious writings in order to misrepresent loyal Mahammedans as the enemies of the Government.

The correspondent further refers to the Jehad of Maulvi Ismail as a reason for suspecting the Ahl-i-Hadis of disloyalty and intrigue. This, however, cannot in any way reflect on the good faith and loyalty of the Ahl-i-Hadis ; because, as we have already stated, the Maulvi waged Jehad against the Sikhs, who interfered with the performance of the religious duties of Islam, and not against the English, who do not countenance any interference in religious matters. On the contrary, as we showed by a quotation from the treatise of the Honorable Syad Ahmad in our last number, the Maulvi openly declared that Jehad was unlawful against the English. How can the Jehad of Maulvi Ismail, in the face of these facts, be construed into an argument for suspecting the sincerity of the professions of loyalty and good faith made by the Ahl-i-Hadis ? * * *

THE THIRD WORK, for publishing which the Siddiq Hasan Khan has been charged with disloyalty or hostility to the Government, is the Tarjman-i-Wahabia which was written and published in 1884. An English translation of this work was also published at Calcutta in the same year. The critics

of the Nawab have impressed on the Government that the work in question has been written in praise and defence of Wahabis—an act which shows that the writer is far from being friendly to the British. The discussion of a subject like this, they say, at a time when Government is engaged in the difficult task of fighting against the Mehdi and that too by the husband of the Begum of Bhopal, one of the chief native States in India, was highly impolitic.

They further state that it has been persistently stated in the Tarjman that those who pass under the name of Wahabi in India are peaceful and loyal subjects of the Queen-Empress, and that the writer is an admirer of Wahabeeism, &c., &c.

Perhaps this statement they support by the following passage in the Iqtrab-us-Sait (the 4th work written by the Nawab), with regard to which they assert that "the Mehdi is stated as being like Abdul Wahab, the founder of Wahabeeism, in order to incite the Wahabis to Jehad"; or in other words, the fact of the Nawab's praising Wahabeeism is equivalent to his espousing the cause of the Mehdi and exciting the Indian Wahabis to aid the latter.

It is true that in the work in question the Nawab defends the Ahl-i-Hadis community of India, styled Wahabis by their enemies, and has refuted the charge of disloyalty against them. It is also true that in the Iqtrab the Mehdi is stated to be like Abdul Wahab of Nejed. But the conclusion which has been drawn from these statements is entirely wrong and misleading. Such a conclusion would have been perfectly justified if the Nawab had expressed his concurrence with the creed of Abdul Wahab, or that he himself and the Ahl-i-Hadis in India were his followers. But since the Nawab has, in several works, declared that he and the other Ahl-i-Hadis, so far from concurring, differ from him and do not follow him, it is anything but fair to draw the conclusion which the Nawab's enemies have drawn. On the contrary, it may be reasonably inferred that the Nawab prohibited the Ahl-i-Hadis in India

from taking up the cause of the Mehdi, as the latter was like Abdul Wahab, who belonged to a different creed from theirs, and that consequently they must not think of aiding him or expressing satisfaction at his successes.

Now, in order to establish that this is the only conclusion which can be drawn from the passages in dispute, and that the opposite conclusion is wrong, the point which need be proved is whether the Nawab has or has not in his works expressed his concurrence and that of the Ahl-i-Hadis with the views of Abdul Wahab ; and whether the Ahl-i-Hadis actually do or do not follow Abdul Wahab.

In support of our assertion that the Nawab has neither declared nor he and the Ahl-i-Hadis actually follow Abdul Wahab, we quote some passages from the works of the Nawab, and defy those who hold an opposite view to produce a single passage, or even a line, from the works of the Nawab or of any other Ahl-i-Hadis in which he has declared himself to be the follower of Abdul Wahab. We will first show from the Tarjman that the Nawab denies being either a Wahabi or a follower of Abdul Wahab.

At page 6 the writer remarks :—

“ The present work has been undertaken with a view to show to Government, that there is no Musulman in the Native States and no British Musulman subject who is inimical to the Government ; that such of those living in Native States as have been charged with Wahabeeism by their enemies, are certainly not Wahabis.”

And again on the same page :—

“ In India and the Native States in particular, there is no Wahabi in the general acceptation of the word, and no atheistical layman, and none ill-disposed towards the liberal and benign Government ; and if there is any let us know who these Wahabis are, where and in what Native State are they to be met with, and what materials of war and rebellion and what means of abetting the rebels they possess. The curse

of God be on liars. Men evilly disposed try by means of trick and treachery to fasten their own guilt upon others, and thus get themselves honoured by the *Hakims*. But God always puts the liars to disgrace."

The following occurs on page 14 :—

"*Question.* Who was Abdul Wahab of Nedjed, the so-called founder of the Wahabis? Both he and his son were the followers of the Imam Hambal, while the Indian Musalmans are either *Shias*, and the followers of Imam Abu Hanifa, or *Amil-bil-Hadis*, *i.e.*, those who follow the sayings of the prophet without reference to any particular *Imam*. The followers of Imam Hambal are not to be found in India.

Muhamed, the son of Abdul Wahab, was born in Ainia, in the Province of Nedjed, in the year 1115 A. H. In 1200 A. H. he made himself public in parts of Hedjas and Yaman. He died in 1206 A. H. and belonged to the Hambli church. The followers of Imam Hambal are generally found in Hedjas and Yaman, but not a single Hambali is to be found in India.

True Islam enjoins adherence to the Koran and the sayings of the Prophet, and not to the teachings of any particular professor of religion. It is, therefore, quite wrong to call Abdul Wahab and his son, who lived and died as Hamblis, founders of any new religious sect. To charge, therefore, such Musalmans as act up to the dictates of the Koran, and follow the sayings of the Prophet alone, with being the followers of Abdul Wahab, betrays sheer ignorance and a spirit of uncharitableness.

An orthodox Musulman thinks it his first duty to obey God and His Prophet above all other religious and sectarian views. He makes God and His Prophet his sole guide and pays no regard to the words of any religious demagogues, not to mention Mahamed-bin-Abdul Wahab, who is of no consequence compared to them. Islam has produced thousands of learned men ; but no Musalman, even the very lowest, thinks it his duty to tread in their path or believes that he will arrive at

the real truth only by adopting any particular course indicated by them.

In short, the history of the Musalmans of India ever since the introduction of Islam in India is briefly this:—At the time of the introduction and propagation of Islam in India the rulers of this country happened by chance to be Hanfis. The people as a rule followed them. This state of things once commenced has continued up to this time. As a matter of course, all the learned men, Kazis, Muftis, and other State-officials and influential persons, were men of the Hanfia persuasion. So that a body of learned men collected the Fatwae Hindia, also called Fatwae Alamgiri for having been compiled by the order and during the reign of the Emperor Aurangzebe Alamgir. Sheik Abdurrahim of Delhi, father of the well-known Shah Wali-ullah, was also among the number.

After him came Sah Waliullah, a great Mohaddis and doctor among the Hanfis and a strict adherent of Sunnat and Jamaat. He examined good many religious doctrines and distinguished between the sound and the unsound ones.

Mohamed Ismail of Delhi, his grandson, followed in his wake. He explained the true laws of Mohamed and rooted out paganistic theories and heretical doctrines which greatly interfere with the peace and well-being of Musalmans in this as well as the next world. He eradicated many evils and customs that were productive of mischief in this and the world to come.

In short, the family of Mohamed-bin-Abdul Wahab was the follower of the tenets of Imam Hambal, and Maulvi Mahomed Ismail, a native of India, had no connection with him as a disciple. Nor is there any reason to suppose that they were known to each other. How then are the learned and the illiterate of this country, spoken of as followers of Mahamed-bin-Abdul Wahab, is a mystery to every thinking mind, and betrays nothing but sheer ignorance and inimical feelings of a certain class of people. For everybody knows

that since the time of Mahamed-bin-Abdul Wahab up to the present, there has been no communication or friendly intercourse between the people of India and the inhabitants of Nedjed. In short, there is not the least comparison between the ways and manners of the people of this country and those of the Nedjedians. Moreover, none of the sects of the Indian Musalmans has even maintained, in words or writing, that true faith and pure Islam are to be found in the followers of the Nedjedian teachers alone, and that the rest are only a benighted flock."

At page 27 he says :—

"To call the believers of one Supreme and Omnipotent Deity by the name of Wahabis and connect them with Mohamed-bin-Abdul Wahab is wrong for various reasons :

First. They do not call themselves by that name : nor do they derive their origin from Abdul Wahab. They have not selected for themselves, the name they go by, unlike the Shias who have chosen to call themselves such in contradistinction to Sunnis. Had they chosen the name 'Wahabis' for themselves they would possess something indicated by the term. On the other hand, they hate the appellation and deny any connection with the title. It is certainly illegal and unreasonable therefore to call any one by an annoying title or nickname. The truth is that we, the believers of one God and followers of the true prophet, consider it an abuse to be called Wahabis, and do not connect ourselves with any of the ancient famous Imams. Neither do we call ourselves Hanafis or Shafais, nor are we pleased with the title Hamblis or Malikis. How is it possible then to follow Mohamed-bin-Abdul Wahab and accept the creed set up by him ?

Secondly. In order to be initiated into the secrets of any religion, it is necessary that one should be the pupil of a religious teacher, or be his home disciple, believe in his powers, or be his fellow-countryman. Now, then, the admission of the Indian Musalmans into the creed of Abdool Wahab, depends upon their

passing through the above initiatory states. But it so happens that they do not possess any of the connecting links to favour the above presumption.

Thirdly. A long period has elapsed since the death of Mohamed-bin-Abdul Wahab. In Nedjed where he was born and bred, he has not left any grandsons or great grandsons to teach his doctrine to the people or persuade the Indians and the Arabians to follow his doctrines. Nor do the Indians follow his creed or conform themselves to his teachings. It is highly unjust then to call them Wahabis and connect them with Mohamed-bin-Abdul Wahab.

After devoting several chapters without comment to the History of the Wahabis of Nedjed, the writer at page 59 says :—

“ In fine, no one appears to have written in any book or history anything more than that given in these seven chapters. The facts enumerated correspond with the investigation of Christian theologains, decidedly admitting of no further investigation.

It appears from the above-mentioned facts that there is no Indian Musalman that is a follower of Wahabeeism ; because the doings of the Wahabis in Arabia generally and Mecca and Medina particularly, and the molestation received at their hands by the people of Hejaz and the inhabitants of those holy cities, have never been perpetrated by the Musalmans of India. None in India can be so audacious.

It also appears that the Wahabi sedition was completely crushed in 1818 A. D. ; and no one rich or poor in Nedjed, did afterwards rise in rebellion.”

And further on at page 74 the writer remarks :—“We are not bound to follow either Abdul Wahab or Mohammed Ismail of Delhi” There are numerous other passages to the same effect in the Tarjman. In fact the work was written solely for the purpose of showing that the Ahl-i-Hadis were not Wahabis and that they had no connection whatever with the Wahabis in

Nedjed. The work is a defence of the Ahl-i-Hadis whom their enemies call Wahabis. The critics have misrepresented the object of the work as being an advocacy of Wahabeeism of which they say the Nawab is an admirer. When this work was published we made the following remarks in vol. 6 :— That the work in question is gospel for thorough-going Mohammedans who consider it a part and parcel of their creed to pay due regard to the claims of Government and the people. It is an excellent deterrent for ignorant Mohammedans who take delight in seeing Mohammedans fighting with the followers of other religions and joining them under the impression that such an act is a lawful Jihad. It is an honest councillor for the Government and is eminently calculated to cement the bonds of union among the Mohammedans of various sects.” After giving our reasons for the above remarks at considerable length we suggested that the Government or the Nawab should publish an English translation of this work. This suggestion commended itself to the Nawab who caused a translation of it to be published at Calcutta which was at the time approved by the Government and by men of light and leading.

The *Indian Chronicle* of the 6th April 1885, commenting on the Tarjman, remarked that the Nawab had laid right-thinking men under a debt of gratitude, and that he was entitled to the thanks of Government. A copy of this work was sent by the Begum to the then Viceroy and Governor-General, Lord Ripon, who thanked the Begum in his letter dated 26th December 1884. It is a pity that what was then considered a praiseworthy act should now be represented as an act of disloyalty.

Similar passages occur in the Mawaiul Awaid, which was published two years before the Tarjman. For instance, after repeating the passage quoted from page 27 of the Tarjman, the writer says at page 37 :—

“To call those Indian Muhammadans who do not worship tombs and *pirs* and prohibit people from unlawful acts by the-

name Wahabi is entirely false for several reasons. In the first place, they do not represent themselves as such, on the contrary they call themselves Sunnis in opposition to Shias and Mottabib in opposition to Maqalids. If there were anything of Wahabeeism in their creed, they would call themselves by that name and should not resent the epithet. But, as a matter of fact, we resent the epithet as if it were an abuse. Since we do not follow even the Imams Hanfi, Shafi, Malki and Humibli, what could be the meaning of our being the followers of Mohammed-bin-Abdul Wahab ? ” The Nawab then goes on to give his reasons, which we cannot reproduce for want of space. It may be urged by the opponents of the Ahl-i-Hadis that these passages in which the author denies being a Wahabi were written after the rebuke administered by General Daly in 1884 ; but to show the groundlessness of such an assumption, we will refer our critics to those works which were written several years previous to 1881. One of these works is the Hidayat-us-Sail, the very work which is adduced as a proof of the Nawab’s disloyalty. At page 121 of this work, he says. “ We are not bound to follow either Abdul Wahab or Mohammed Ismail of Delhi ” ; and again at page 114 :—

“ His treatises are well known, but they cannot be had in India. These treatises contain maxims both authenticated and unauthenticated. Abdul Wahab is more especially blamed for two vices : one, that he calls everybody an infidel without reason ; and secondly, he resorted to bloodshed without sufficient cause.” At page 116, after showing that it is a mistake to say that Abdul Wahab was justified in calling the Muhammadans as infidels, and stating the reason of such mistake he says :—

“ Hence it is clear that one who commits a mistake is not an infidel. The learned of the past and present age, as also the Ahl-i-Hadis, &c., are at one on this point. We say nothing of those who call persons guilty of certain superstitious Kafirs, but we hesitate in calling him a Kafir for several reasons. Firstly, according to the prophet, those who call others Kafirs are liable

to be severely punished." The Nawab then gives six other reasons showing that Abdul Wahab was mistaken in calling people infidels. At page 119, after stating that Shah Wali Ullah of Delhi and his sons were the first to introduce the Ahl-i-Hadis religion in India, the Nawab writes as follows on page 120 :—

" Some of the selfish Ulimas, finding that the introduction of the Ahl-i-Hadis religion interfered with their income and position, rose against the Ahl-i-Hadis and named this sect as Wahabis in order to excite the people against them, although they knew full well that Abdul Wahab belonged to the Hainbli Church, while Shah Wali Ullah was a Hanfi and had no connection whatever as a disciple, &c., with Abdul Wahab."

Another work, entitled the *Hitah-fi-Ahwalis Sihahisistah*, which the Nawab published in 1866 *i.e.*, 15 years before the rebuke administered by General Daly in 1881, contains the same remark which we quoted from the *Hidayat-us-Sail* (page 114). The writer at page 73 says :—

" The treatises of Abdul Wahab of Nedjed are well-known. They contain maxims authenticated and unauthenticated. He is blamed more especially for two vices, *viz.* one, that he called everybody an infidel without reason ; and secondly, because he resorted to bloodshed on insufficient cause. Mahamed-bin-Abdul Wahab thought that he had based his creed on that of Ibu Taim and Ibu-ul-Qyama, and he adopted their maxims so far as he knew them. In adopting these maxims he was right in some respects, but in others he made a mistake and misapprehended them."

It is clear from these passages that the Nawab proves that the Ahl-i-Hadis do not concur but differ from Abdul Wahab, and consequently his comparison of the Mehdi with Abdul Wahab proves that the Nawab condemns the former and prohibits people from aiding him. It is entirely wrong to conclude from this that he praises the Mehdi or urges people to take up his cause.

The fourth work, on account of which the Nawab is charged with rebellion, is the Iqtrab-us-Sait, which was published at Agra by Nurul Hassan, a son of the Nawab. The critics of the Nawab have impressed on Government that the real author of the work is the Nawab himself, and that in order to create a rebellion in the country and at the same time to save himself from its consequences he has published it at Agra as the work of his son.

They have made exactly the same remark regarding the Iqtrab-us-Sait as the Tarjuman Wahabia, *viz.*, that "the discussion of a subject like this at a time when Government is engaged in the difficult task of fighting the Mehdi, and that too by the husband of the Begum of Bhopal, one of the chief native states, is highly impolitic."

They also state, that this work contains passages, in which the people are openly incited to rebellion, and refer to the pages and lines containing the passages in question, which we quote according to the order in which they have referred to them in the following table, with a view to replying to them in the same order.

No.	No. of page.	Line.	S U B J E C T.
1	6	11	The time of the Mehdi's appearance is near at hand.
2	6	19 to 20	The supremacy of the Christians is a sign of the near approach of Qiamat (last day).
3	37	9	Every virtuous man may be called a Mehdi.
4	41	20	The reason of the decline of Muhammadans is that they have given up Jihad.

No.	No. of page.	Line.	S U B J E C T.
5	57	1	The people of every country are bound to tender their allegiance to the ruler of that country whether he be a Non-Koreshi or a usurper.
6	57	5	We helpless people are living under rulers who do not follow the Sunnat or the prophet. They are devils at heart though human in shape.
7	58	11 to 13	One who makes Jehad with the hand is a momin (or true believer).
8	59	9	Shahid is one who is killed in action in the path of God.
9	64	13	Her Majesty Queen Victoria and His Excellency the Viceroy will be dragged before the Mehdi with chains in their necks.
10 to 15	116 to 120	1 to 13	The history of the Mehdi of Soudan ; 11 that he can be a Mujadad ; 12 the belief of the Nawab that all infidels will be killed by the Mehdi ; 13 that the account of his reverses given in the English papers is false ; 14 that the Mehdi resembles Abdul Wahab (in order to excite the Ahl-i-Hadis) ; 15 that there can be a Mujadad in every century who strengthens the faith by means of the Jehad and saves it from all temporary dangers. This statement, it is alleged, is made in order to excite the people to Jehad and induce them to regard the Mehdi of Soudan as a Mujadad, though not the true Mehdi.

No.	No. of pages.	Line.	S U B J E C T.
16	120 140 141 220 221	15 & 17 21 1 17 4	Prayer for the appearance of the Mehdi and the advent of Christ ; that the Mehdi is expected to appear in the beginning of the present century ; that he is expected to appear in the fourth year of the 14th century.
17	*	...	That the present is an age of vice and sin.
18	*	...	The anxiety of the writer to prove that the signs of the Mehdi as given in the traditions are incorrect and that the tradition containing them is unreliable. The object of the Nawab in so doing is that the absence of any qualification in the Mehdi of Soudan may be attributed to the incorrectness of the tradition, and not that the Mehdi is not the real Mehdi ; in order to show that he may be a true prophet, though not so in strict accordance with the tradition. The Nawab has here and there referred to the Mehdi as the false prophet merely to conceal the real object of the work, and that he has given no other reason for his being a false prophet than that it is necessary for the Mehdi to be descended from a Sayad, so that the Soudan Mehdi may be regarded by the people as the true Mehdi if he could be proved to be a Sayad, and to convince the people of India of this is very easy.

* The number of pages and lines is not given. A portion of No. 17 can be found in pages 43, 52 and 54 ; but No. 18 is not to be found at all.

By far the greater portion of this work has been wrongly quoted, and wherever it has been correctly quoted the conclusion drawn is diametrically opposed to what is meant by the writer. There is not a single passage, whether referred to by the Nawab's opponents or not, showing that the Nawab has attempted to incite the Indian Muhammadans to rebel against the British and aid the Mehdi, or that he wrote or caused this book to be written for that purpose. On the contrary, it is clearly stated that "at the present time there is no condition justifying a lawful Jihad in existence, and it is simply impossible that the Mehdi of Soudan should be the real Mehdi. Those who regard him as the true Mehdi are ignorant of Islam : in fact they are infidels." In short, the object of the work is to induce people not to regard the Mehdi of Soudan and his Jihad as a lawful one.

Before showing that the critics exaggerated and perverted the facts we will quote those passages which prove that the work was actually written with object we have assigned to it. At page 2, line 4, after the Khutba the author observes :—

At present *fitnas* are the order of the day not only in worldly but also in religious matters. For some time past, a hue and cry has been raised that somebody in Soudan in Egyptian territory has claimed to be the Mehdi. He first fought with Egypt and now the British Government is engaged in suppressing him. The Jawaib, &c., sometimes mention this man as false Mehdi and sometimes as *Mutimahdi* (a pretender) ; common people who are neither learned nor endowed with common sense jump to curious conclusions on hearing these things. They are ready to raise disturbances at the appearance of every pretender. They are not aware that during the last thirteen hundred years there have been several Mehdis (good and bad) whom some people like themselves took for the real Mehdi. But no learned man acknowledged their pretensions to the Mehdiship whether the pretenders were good men or otherwise. There have been about twenty such men whose names and detailed history are

given in the Hijajjul Krama (a work of the Nawab). Even in Jaunpore, one Syad Mohammed pretended to be the Mehdi, but he was not successful, only a small number of people joined him and their descendants are still to be found in Hyderabad. Of the pretenders, those who were virtuous claimed the Mehdiship while they were in a state of *sukr* (ecstacy) and repented afterwards, but others represented themselves as Mehdi for the sake of territorial aggrandisement. Some of these latter were successful in some countries. For instance, a person named Mehdi was born among the Qarmta. He was a Jew but he passed himself as a *syad* and made a large number of people Rafzis. His family continued to reign over Egypt for several centuries without intermission. Such *fitnas* (disturbances) have always occurred in the world. Indeed, some people have had the audacity to pretend to be prophets while others have set themselves up as gods. These were, one and all, really *dajals* or Anti-Christians. The true prophet has prophesied that there will be about 30 false Anti-Christians among the Muhammadans. The names of all such pretenders are given in works on history, while the accounts of those who are appearing from time to time are being recorded by men of learning from time to time.

Ibn Abdirab-i-hi, in the third volume of the Iqd-ul-Farid, states that one man pretended to be Mehdi in the time of the caliph Mehdi, while another pretender appeared in Busreh, a third represented himself as Abraham in the time of Mamun ; a fourth claimed the Mehdiship in the time of Mehdi ; while a fifth appeared in the time of Khalid-bin-Abdula Qasri, who wrote a verse in opposition to one of the Quran.

A sixth pretender claimed the Mehdiship in the court of Abdulla-bin-Hazm. Shamam-bin-Ashras saw a man in imprisonment who pretended to be a prophet. The eighth man who claimed to be prophet appeared at Riqqa in the time of Haroun Rashid. The ninth false prophet appeared in the time of Mamun Rashid. The tenth and eleventh appeared in Kharasan and Kufa. The twelfth pretender was in the time of Mamun.

The thirteenth pretender called himself Noah, and prophesied that another deluge was about to come. The 14th pretender was brought from Azarbajian in the time of Mamun. Before these Aswad Anasi, Musailma Kazab, &c., also pretended to be prophets. Altogether there have been seventeen false prophets. An account of them is given in the Iqd-ul-Farid, &c.

At page 5 the author continues :—“No true Muhammadan can take part in a commotion, whether in wordly or religious matters (*sic*). At such time, according to the Muhammadan law, they should break their arrows, swords and lances. They must neither kill anybody, nor abet others in doing so. They must neither raise disturbances, nor advise others to do so. On the contrary, if anyone attempts to kill them, they should allow themselves to be killed, because it is better to be oppressed than being an oppressor. This world is merely a dream and a mirage. Those who live in this world are merely travellers. The moment they close their eyes they find that it was nothing. We must see that we fare well in the next world which is yet to come. Nominal Muhammadans there are countless, while true believers are very rare indeed. Some raise the standard of Jihad ; others talk about reform in Islam. Some pretend to be Mehdi, and others represent themselves as Imams. It is a matter of indifference to them what is true Islam. They consider it is Islam to raise disturbances and that commotion is reform.”

The following passage occurs on page 6 :—

“If they had been in the habit of studying Hadis and Quran they should have known that the present is the period of Christian supremacy and not their decline. Why,* then, are such schemes being matured before the *advent of Christ and of the Mehdi ? The result, in our opinion of all this, will be disastrous in this world as well as in the next, and not for our good in the next. The minor preliminaries of the last day have already come to pass. Among the chief signs of the approach of the day of judgment is the* supremacy of the Christians, which is visible to all men, great and small, in land and sea. The second

sign is the appearance of the true* Mehdi, the third being* the descent of Christ from the heavens. The first sign has already appeared, and it shows that the second and third are about to appear. Why, then, should we be in a hurry to long for the speedy downfall of Christian supremacy, so that none but Mahommadans should remain ? He who has placed over us the Christians will change the existing state of things when it pleases him. The earth and heaven are not under our command that we should succeed in our plans and raise all sorts of disturbances."

At page 7 it is stated "there has not been a single disturbance or commotion which has not been already prophesied in the Hadis. Those alone give *fatwas* of Jehad who are unacquainted with the science of Hadis, as the conditions of Jehad have long since been conspicuous by their absence in the world. We do not say that Jehad is not allowed by Islam, or that the order for Jehad has been set aside. What we say is, that war at the present time, whether between Mahommadans and Kafirs, or among the Mahommadans themselves, cannot be called Jehad."

At page 9 the author says :—" Rebellion, originated with Moawya. From that time Mahommadan rulers have been fighting among themselves to the great mischief of mankind.

It was from similar motives that some people pretended to be Mehdies and others claimed their right to succeed to the caliphate. The history of Islam also records the names of others who took unlawful possession of the kingdoms of others, or who raised the standard of revolt and became independent."

Further on the writer gives an account of the false prophets including the pretenders to the Mehdiship, and at page 19 says, "as for impostors, their number is legion, among these are the false Mehdies whose number is also considerable."

At page 37 the author observes :—"The man who passes

* The opponents of the Nawab take him to task for these statements, and will be replied to further on.

under the name of Mehdi of Soudan is certainly not the true Mehdi as he does not possess the qualities which the real Mehdi ought to do according to the prophecy ; as for the title Mehdi it is applicable to every pious and virtuous man ; but the question is about the Fatimite Mehdi and not those who bear that name. Even the four caliphs are referred to as Mehdis. Similarly, in Abasia and Qaramta there have been several persons of that name ; some vicious and pious persons have also claimed to be Mehdis. Mehdi means one who has found the true way and hence every body who has found the true way can be called a Mehdi. The real Mehdi will not merely be a Mehdi but also one who will show the true path. Mehdi will be his title only and his real name will be Mohammed-bin-Abdulla and he will appear at Mecca and not at any other place. Let the signs, which according to the prophecy should precede the Mehdi appear, and then the true Mehdi will appear. Ignorant people base every-thing on their own imaginations. They neither possess common-sense, nor do they follow the prophecy contained in works of authority.”

The writer then devotes pages 68 to 121 to a detailed account of the signs which will precede the Mehdi. These signs are some twenty-one in number, among them “the rising up of a gold rock out of the river Euphrates ; the spread of infidelity in Arabia by Sufiani ; the appearance of the army of Haris of Khorasan ; the battle at Median ; the reconquest of Constantinople ; the appearance of a hand from the heavens, which will take place about the time of the appearance of the Anti-Christ.”

At page 56 the author says :—

The Muhammadans are not united ; nor have they any Imam. At present they should hold themselves aloof. There are two Muhammadan Kingdoms ; one in Turkey and the other in Morocco, but their rulers are not Imams or caliphs and are called Sultan or Deputy Imams, as it is necessary for an Imam to be a Koreish.

Again at page 56 it is stated that :—

“To make Jihad with the hand is the work of the Imams ; to fight with the tongue is the work of the learned ; to feel disgusted (at vice) at heart is the work of the common people. The Imams are no longer to be found ; while as regards the learned, those who, by preaching or compiling books, try to induce people to follow the Quran and the traditions, make Jehad, while those who keep quiet are dumb devils.” At page 59 the author observes :—‘A martyr in this case—*i. e.*, in the tradition which says that acting according to the Quran is equal to a hundred martyrdoms—is one who is killed in a fight in the way of God ; to obtain such martyrdom at the present time is quite out of the question.’ And at page 118 the writer says :—

“As regards the question whether the Mehdi of Soudan is the real Mehdi. There is no reason to show that he is the true Mehdi although according to the reply of Osman Digma he claims to be Mehdi and at the same time a leader of the faithful ; but where are the qualities which according to the prophecy he should possess ? Several persons good and bad before him have already claimed the Mehdiship but without success.”

At page 119 it is stated, “We do not know who is the man who calls himself Mehdi of Soudan, who calls himself Syad and son of Abdulla. Surely he is not the real Mehdi.”

The following passage occurs on page 121.

“Common people are apt to follow every pretender and impostor who brays like an ass. Everybody who pretended to be God, Prophet, Mehdi, Mujadad or Mujtahad or Saint, found some people to follow him. Whatever may be the result, people lend their ears to rumour and believe in every gossip.”

The passages quoted above show clearly that the Nawab states with the utmost certainty that the Mehdi of Soudan is not the real Mehdi ; that his Jehad is not a lawful one ; that those who regard him as Mehdi and his Jehad as lawful

are ignorant of the tenets of Islam and devoid of common-sense and that the real object of the work in question is to prevent people from taking up the cause of the Mehdi and not to call upon them to aid him. We will now proceed to prove that the passages on which the opposite conclusions are based are wrong.

As regards No 1, the critics of the Nawab have deceived the Government, inasmuch as at page 6, line II, it is stated at the day of judgment, and not the time for the appearance of the Mehdi is near at hand.

The passage in question runs as follows :—"If you possess common-sense you may depend upon it that these things are the signs of the approach of Qiamat ; those who think that these disturbances, rebellion, promise-breaking will cease and that they will become the rulers of the world by such means before the Mehdi's appearance and before Christ descends from the heavens are like Qais and Farhad, *i. e.*, mad."

As regards the imminence of the Last Day, that has been an article of faith before the British came to India, indeed, ever since the time of the Prophet, and consequently it is anything but just to conclude that any such statement is tantamount to inciting people to rebellion. Nor can the statement that the time for the appearance of the Mehdi is very nearly construed into an attempt at exciting people to rebellion, unless it is also stated that the Mehdi will appear during the time of the British and that the Muhammadans should be prepared to take up his cause. But, as a matter of fact, there is no such statement as that in the work in question, and consequently it is wrong to conclude that the statement—that the Mehdi is about to appear—is equal to an attempt to incite people to rebellion. If mere belief in the Mehdi is equivalent to rebellion, then the author alone is not guilty of the charge, but all Mahommadans alike, whether British subjects or others, including the critics of Siddiq Hassan Khan (with the exception of a few of the Ahl-i-Hadis

of the past and present time),* who do not believe in the advent of the Mehdi. Under these circumstances the critics should have advised the British Government to hang or transport all its Mahommadan subjects who entertain such a belief, or at least some such treatment as that accorded to the Nawab should have been recommended for the chiefs of Mahommadan States, such as Hyderabad, Rampur, Tonk, Bahawalpur, &c., &c., because there is not one of these chiefs who does not believe in the advent of the true Mehdi. This is a fact which the Nawab's critics are fully aware of. Those who are not aware of this article of Mahommadan faith can easily satisfy themselves as to the correctness of our statement. If all those people who believe in the advent of the Mehdi, and whose number is legion, are considered loyal, we fail to see why the Nawab should be regarded as a rebel for entertaining a similar belief.

As regards statement No. 2, the critics of the Nawab have resorted to exaggeration and deceit to a much greater extent. It is true that in the Iqtrab (page 6, line 20) the supremacy of the Christians is stated to be a sign of the approach of the day

* Kazi-ibn-Khaldoon, one of the ancient writers does not believe in the advent of Mehdi; there are also some Ahl-i-Hadis who hold a similar opinion. Their belief, however, is not based on the fact that the miracles and other supernatural phenomena which will accompany the Mehdi are logically impossible, as is the case with the *naturis*. On the contrary they do not believe in the Mehdi because the traditions about him are not quite trustworthy. The more important works on Hadis, namely Sahih Bokhari and Moslim are silent on the subject. This was proved in the Ishat-us-Sunnah long before the Nawab or any other Mahommadan was taken to task on this account. The secondary works contain Hadises which are open to criticism. Kazi-ibn-Khaldoon Hazrmi, in his work entitled " Al-Ibr, Dewanal Mubtada wal Khabar fi Ayyam ul Arab wal Ajum wal Berber," has refuted all the traditions on the subject. The Nawab has replied to these criticisms in the Hijajul Karama, &c., but his reply, so far from refuting the criticisms of Ibn-Khaldoon, strengthens them. We hope to be able to write on the subject hereafter and deal with these traditions at length. The object of the present note is simply to show that some Ahl-i-Hadis of the past and present time do not believe in the advent of the Mehdi. The fact of the Mahommadans generally of the Nawab entertaining such a belief does not show that all the Ahl-i-Hadis believe in Mehdi.

of judgment, but it is entirely wrong to construe this statement into a reflection on the Christian system of Government or an attempt at inciting people to rebellion. Such an insinuation would have been justified if in the Iqtrab or other Mahommadan works it had been alleged that everything which is considered a sign of the approach of the day of judgment would be necessarily bad. But since even good things (among them the descent of Christ, the appearance of the Mehdi, the conquest of Jerusalem, and the rising up of a gold rock out of the River Euphrates, as detailed at page 19, 20, 60, and 68) are admitted by the author to be the signs of the Qiamat, it is simply preposterous to conclude that such a statement is calculated to reflect prejudicially on the Christian system of Government or that it is calculated to create a rebellion.

This reminds us of a story of the Sikh times when some clever servants similarly made a fool of their ignorant master. There was a Sikh Rais of the name of Karam Singh, most of whose employees were uneducated and ignorant. A Farsi Khan (Persian scholar) unfortunately entered the service and gained the confidence of the Sirdar on account of his great abilities. This excited the jealousy of the rest of the servants, who told the Rais that the Farsi Khawn was so impudent as to write his name with a small instead of a big Qaf.* The Sirdar accordingly dismissed the Farsi Khawn. It is a pity that our brethren should have played a similar trick with the British Government, by telling them that the Nawab had stated their supremacy as being one of the signs of the approach of the day of judgment, without stopping for a moment to think of the risk they would run when Government came to know that what are regarded as the signs of the Qiamat are not necessarily all bad.

Statement No. 3 reminds us of the story of the person who attempted to prove that the Qoran prohibited prayer by quoting the first portion of a verse, *viz.*, "do not be near prayer," and omitting the last portion, namely, "when you are drunk."

* The big Qaf is equal to Q and the small kaf to K.

It is true that at page 37 of the Iqtrab it is stated that "as regards the word Mehdi it is applicable to every pious man," but in the sentence preceding and following this quotation it is clearly stated that the Mehdi of Soudan is not the true Mehdi, as will be seen from the whole passage quoted at page 31.

Besides in other passages quoted already the same statement is made with the utmost certainty. The critics deserve great credit for having made a Karam Singh of the Government by omitting the preceding and following sentences and quoting one single sentence in order to show that the so called Mehdi was stated by the Nawab to be the real Mehdi.

The critics have also similarly deceived Government as regards statement No. 4. No doubt the giving up of Jehad is condemned at page 41, &c., but when we find at page 56, 58 and 59, such passages as "to wage Jehad with the hand is the work of the Imams" and that "Imams are no longer to be found;" that "at the present moment there is neither a Muhammadan people nor the Imams;" that "the present is the time for holding aloof and there is now no opportunity of dying a martyr in a fight," we cannot resist the obvious conclusion that the giving up of Jehad is denounced not for the purpose of exciting people to wage it in the future, but merely to give an account of the past. Indeed, such a statement is equal to saying that the Mahommadans retained their supremacy so long as they continued to advance their political power by means of the sword and that by giving up the sword they have become weaker. Remarks like these occur in works written by Mahommadans as well as Christians, but they cannot be regarded in the light of attempts to incite the people to rebellion.

The reason of this is to be found in the fact that the word Jehad does not merely signify a religious war which is waged when the performance of religious duties is interfered with. Even political wars undertaken for purposes of national aggrandisement are also called Jehad. We would refer those who

care to satisfy themselves on this point to the Anjuman Journal of the 25th December 1885, and 1st January 1886.

The Government have also been similarly deceived as regards statement No. 5. It is certainly stated in the Iqtrab (page 57), that it is lawful to submit to a conqueror even if he were a non-Qureshi. The critics of the Nawab have told the Government that this statement means that although the Mehdi of Soudan is not the true Imam and the Mahommadans whether of India or Arabia are bound to submit to him, because he is a conqueror, but the writer, only four lines before this passage at end of page 56, remarks that " it is not lawful for the people of one country to tender their allegiance to a non-Qureshish conqueror of another country." At page 119 the writer according to the admission of his critics, hesitates to admit that the Mehdi is a Syad. It is therefore clear that in the opinion of the author the Mahommadans of India are not bound to tender their allegiance to the Mehdi. The following is the literal rendering of the passage we refer to :—

" At the present time there is neither a sect of Mahommadans nor an Imam. It is a time when we should hold aloof. There are two Mahommadan empires, one in Turkey, the other in Morocco, but their rulers are not Imams and consider themselves the Naibs (deputies) of Imams and are called Sultans and not Caliphs, as it is essential for a Caliph to be a Qureshish. Besides, the Wali of one country cannot lawfully receive the homage of another country which is not under his rule. The subjects are bound to obey the ruler of that country alone. When one ruler cannot administer all Mohammadan countries and the work of administration becomes difficult, then, according to the Mohammadan Law, each country is bound to tender its allegiance to its own ruler or Wali, whether Qureshi or conqueror."

The critics of the Nawab have also played upon the credulity of the Government as regards the 6th and 17th charges. The passages referred to are of course to be found in the Iqtrab

(page 57, &c.), but their object is not to denounce the Government or the political changes that have occurred. On the contrary, the writer bewails at the condition of Mohammadan Umras and the revolution which has occurred in religious matters. In support of this argument we will refer the reader to pages 12, 43, 52 and 54, where the author particularly bewails the change that has come over the Mohammadan religion. Here is what he says on page 12 :—“ Ever since the occurrence of these *fitnas* among Mahommadans, Islam and Mahommadans have ceased to be powerful ; the weakness of both has been increasing from day to day, so much so that only the name of Islam and the letters of the Quran now remain. The mosques are inhabited in appearance, but piety seems to have left them. The Ulemas are the worst under the sun. The *fitnas* proceed from them and go back to them.”

The writer continues to give an account of the 46th sign of the day of judgment at page 43—“ People will feel ashamed to act according to the precepts of the Quran ; Islam will get weak ; Mahomedans shall entertain feelings of hostility ; learning shall disappear ; the age of man shall decrease ; births shall cease ; the produce of land shall decrease ; trustees shall become proprietors and *vice versa* ; liars shall be considered truthful ; murders shall increase ; palaces shall be erected, mothers shall be unhappy on account of their children’s disobedience, barren women shall be happy ; rebellion and selfishness shall increase ; deaths shall increase ; falsehood shall increase and truth shall decrease ; people shall take to diverse callings, become more sensual and pass (sentences) on mere suspicions ; rains shall be very rare and produce less ; learning shall decrease and ignorance shall increase, children shall be the cause of anger ; there shall be heat in the cold weather ; people shall be openly indecent ; the earth shall be contracted ; the Khutib (or the reader of Khutba) shall read false Khutbas ; vicious people shall triumph.”

Again at page 52 the writer quotes a tradition of the pro-

phet on the authority of Huzaifa-bin-Yaman, who states that the prophet said that the signs of the approach of the day of judgment will be 72, and that "people shall cease to worship God ; betray trusts ; take interest ; consider it lawful to tell lies ; will care little about committing murder ; consider it a light offence ; raise high palaces ; sell their religion for the sake of this world ; give up their relatives ; law shall become weak ; falsehood shall be regarded as truth ; people shall put on hair or silk cloths ; when tyranny triumphs and divorces increase, &c.," and similarly at page 54.

In these passages most of the things which are represented as being the signs of the approach of the last day are to be found among the Mahomedans and the object of the writer is to express his regret at them alone. To say that they are meant to reflect on the Government is to make a Karam Singh of the latter. Even if it were granted that the writer has denounced the religion of the Government or the time of Government itself on account of its religion as that of vice it does not prove the writer to be a rebel. We wonder whether there is a single person, Hindu or Mahomedan, with the exception of those who profess no religion, who likes Christianity or who does not dislike Government on account of its religion. Why should we go further than the critics themselves and see if they like Christianity or acknowledge Government as their religious leader. If they do so, why should they call themselves Mahomedans and why should they not get baptized and become Christians.

The critics have, like the man who tried to prove that the Quran prohibited prayer and quoted only one portion of the passage , omitted the rest in No. 7. The tradition in question, no doubt, appears on page 58, but it is at the same time stated "to fight with the hand is the work of the Imams who are no longer to be found. Among the rest the learned can make Jihad by speech and writing, while the Jihad of common people consists in regarding vice a bad thing at heart." Even

this remark is made with reference to the Mahommadans among themselves without reference to others whether Government or other non-Mahommadans. The whole of the passage on page 58 of the Iqtrab is given at page 49.

We leave it to our readers to decide how clearly the meaning of the passage has been distorted in order to deceive the Government and make a Karam Singh of it.

The same remark applies to number 8 in which only a portion of the passage has been quoted and the rest omitted. No doubt it is stated at page 59 that one who is killed in the path of God is a martyr, but it is also stated that "such a martyrdom is quite out of the question at the present time."

The reason why martyrdom is now impossible is also given at page 7, 56 and 58 of the Iqtrab and has been already quoted by us at page 47 and 49.

The passage on page 59 runs as follows :—

"The tradition related by Abu Horaira is "that one who imitates the prophet when the Mahommadans go astray is equal to a hundred martyrs." Here martyr means one who has died in action in the path of God. Such a martyrdom at the present moment is quite out of the question. It is a great thing if we get the martyrdom attainable by imitating the prophet ; but it is a pity that nominal Mahomedans do not benefit themselves by following the Sunnat."

It is clear from the above that the critics have played upon the credulity of the Government in this instance also.

In charge No. 9 the Nawab's critics have not only deceived Government but also have had the audacity to alter the phraseology to suit their own purposes. No mention is made in the Iqtrab (either at page 64 or any other page) of the Empress of India or her Viceroy. The following passage is quoted on page 64 from Ishah-ti-ashrat-ul-Saat. "The true Mehdi (not the Mehdi of Soudan) will conquer city after city from the east to the west ; the kings of India will be brought before him with chains in their necks. His coffers will be

the ornament of Jerusalem." To illustrate this the Nawab (if he is the author) * * * * * says ;— "There is no king in India. There are only a few Hindu and Mahomedan chiefs, who are rulers in name. The Europeans are the great rulers of this country. They will probably remain the rulers of the country till that time, and will be taken before the Mehdi. Or it may be that some other nation will become the ruler of this country. The truth is known to God alone."

In this illustration the Nawab does not instigate the Mahomedans to bring about such a state of things. Indeed, if anything of the sort happens it will happen by supernatural* agency and as a miracle (as is firmly believed by those who believe in the advent of the Mehdi) and not by the power of Mahomedans. Besides, the Nawab does not express his certainty about the Queen and her representative being brought before the Medhi. On the contrary, he expresses his curiosity as to whether the rulers at that time will be Europeans or others, and he emphasises his doubt by saying that " truth is known to God alone." It cannot be concluded from this illustration (which merely states the belief of the Mahommadans, and that too in a very doubtful manner) that the Nawab calls upon the Mahommadans to take the Queen and her representative, &c., to the Mehdi or that he delights in the thought of their being taken to the Mehdi. Such a conclusion would have been justified if the writer had expressed his certainty that the Mehdi would appear during the time of the British, and had instigated the Mahommadans to take some hostile action against the Government. As a matter of fact, Mahommadans generally believe that before the day of judgment Islam will spread all over the world, and that no other religion, Christianity,

* *Vide Iqtrab*, page 64, line 21, in which it is stated " God will aid him by 3,000 angels who will strike his enemies on the face and the back. The advanced guard will be under the command of Gabriel and the rear guard under Michael and so on *ad infinitum*.

Judiasm, &c., will remain. If mere belief like this is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that those who entertain such a belief are rebels, then there can be very few of British subjects who can be free from this charge. * * * * *

In statements 10 to 15 a similar course has been resorted to. From page 116 line 7, to page 120 line 13, there is not a single passage in which the author instigates the Mahommadans. Page 116, from line 7 to end of that page, contains an account of the Mehdi of Soudan taken from the *London News* of 1st December 1883, and further on an account of the battles fought and victories gained by the Mehdi is given from the Jaiwab and the English and Native papers. At the end of these accounts the following remark is made with reference to these battles—"This *fitna* (or disturbance) still continues," or in other words the Mehdi's battles are represented as being equivalent to sedition and disturbances, and not lawful *Jehad*. The writer then reproduces from the *Pioneer* of the 4th April 1884, a letter of Usman Digma in reply to the proclamation of the British and at page 118 makes the following remark on Usman Digma's reply :—

" The true Mehdi will do the same work as is stated in the reply of Usman Digma, *i.e.*, he will compel Mohammadans to follow the *Qoran* and the prophet, and compel infidels to embrace Islam. Those who oppose him will perish, whether they be nominal Mohammadans or others, (as is clear from this letter). As regards the question whether the Mehdi of Soudan is the true Mehdi, no definite opinion can be formed on that head, although it appears from the reply of Usman Digma that he claims to be both a pious man and a leader of the Mohammadans, but the true qualities, which according to tradition he should possess, are not to be found in him. Similar claims have already been advanced by wicked men, but they were found to be untrue. If this is the true reply, and is not the work of newspaper correspondents, then he may possibly be a *Mujadad*. A *Mujadad* appears at the end or beginning of a century.

Tajdid (revival) is sometimes effected by the sword, at others by preaching."

Again at page 119 the writer says :—"We do not know who or what sort of a man is the Mujadad, who calls himself Mehdi of Soudan and represents himself as the son of Abdulla. Surely he is not the Mehdi. After quoting the *Pioneer* of the 10th April 1884 the author remarks :—" But there is nothing to prevent his being a Mujadad provided he possesses the qualities of one. We do not know what goes on behind a wall ; how can we know correctly what is taking place at such a distance. News-writers and Editors are not impartial people, they always write what is politic and shape every item of news to suit their own purposes. Although every item of news is liable to be exaggerated, but the news-writers of the present day are one and all untrustworthy. It is perhaps by an oversight that now and then they give a few correct items of news out of a thousand such items."

The account given in these passages is from the *London News*, *Pioneer*, &c., and if to give such an account is to rebel against the Governmet, the papers from which it has been taken are more to blame than the Nawab. As regards the inference that the Mehdi is a Mujadad, that too has been drawn from the account given by these papers. Besides, the Nawab is not positive on this head, as he states that if this reply to the proclamation of the British Government is genuine and not the work of newspaper correspondents or other impostors, then it is possible that the Soudanee may be a Mujadad. To emphasize his doubt, the writer says that "he can be a Mujadad if he possesses the qualifications of one." That the Nawab is doubtful as to whether the Mehdi actually possesses such qualifications is clear from the remark, that "if we do not know what is going on behind a wall, how can we know correctly what is going on at such a distance." Besides, the fact of the writer considering newspapers untrustworthy shows that he is doubtful as to whether the Mehdi is a Mujadad. To draw any other

conclusion from these passages, *viz.*, that the writer admits the Mehdi to be a Mujadad and regards the accounts of his reverses given in newspapers as unreliable is nothing but falsehood and deception.*

It is clear from the remarks we have made that statements 10, 11 and 13 are misleading. As regards No. 12 no such statement has been made in reference to the Mehdi of Soudan, but about the true Mehdi as detailed at page 118 of the Iqtrab as quoted at page 59 of this article. As we have twice already stated such a belief is entertained by all Muhammadans with the exception of a few. Besides, it does not contain any instigation and does not refer particularly to the British Government. Under such circumstances to infer this as rebellion is to brand all Muhammadan subjects of the Queen with disloyalty and to deceive the Government.

With reference to No. 14 we have already remarked at page 18 that the Mehdi of Soudan has not been compared to Abdul Wahab for the purpose of exciting people to rebel against Government and aid the Mehdi, but to induce them to regard him as a bloodthirsty tyrant and agitator like Abdul Wahab, and therefore to refrain from taking up his cause. Any other inference is quite unjustifiable. Statement No. 15 is not to be found in the Iqtrab at all; on the contrary, the following remark, which fully contradicts the statement under notice, appears on pages 118 and 119. "Tajdid (revival) is sometimes effected by the sword and sometimes by preaching. But it is essentially necessary for the Mujadad to revive the Sunnat and destroy superstition. He should not covet riches, sovereignty and dignity; should do no religious act for the sake of this world but for the sake of God.

Given these conditions, and anyone can be a Mujadad, whether he be king such as Umar-bin-Abdul Aziz, or Iman,

* In the work in question the writer considers those conditions as untrustworthy which show him to be a Mujadad, and not the account of his reverses as wrongly stated by his opponents.

as Iman Ahmed-bin-Habal, or Durwesh, as Sheikh-ul-Islam-Ibn-Taimia or Qazi, as Imam Mohamed Showkani or Mujtahid as Sayad Mohamed-bin-Ismail, Amir Yamani, or a Sufi as Ibn -Arabi. In fact there can be a Mujadad in every nation and tribe. Indeed, there have been more than one Mujadads at one and the same time in various places. The modes of Tajdid or revival of Islam are also numerous and not one in particular. It is clearly stated in the passage that a Mujadad can do his work by means of the sword, or pen, or preaching, as is done by the Ulemas, Sufis and Qazis, and that it is not by the sword alone that Tajdid takes place. Our critics have magnified a rope into a snake, and frightened the Government and made a Karam Singh of them.

The critics have similarly deceived Government as regards No. 16. The passages referred to are no doubt to be found at pages 120, 140, 141, 220 and 221, but it is utterly wrong to infer that they are meant to incite the people to rebel against our present rulers. There are three statements in these passages (1) belief in the appearance of the Mehdi and the descent of Christ from the heavens ; secondly, the expression of a wish for their speedy appearance; and thirdly, the probability of their appearing in the 14th century. As regards the first point, we have already stated that such a belief is entertained by the Mahommadan subjects of the Queen in general (including the native Mahommadan chiefs), as also the Mahommadans of Arabia and other Mahommadan countries and that such a belief does not prove that they are rebels. The same remark equally applies to the second and third points.

Those who believe in the appearance of the Mehdi and Christ, also long and pray for their speedy appearance. The compiler of the Ishah-li-Ashrat-us-Saha was the first to express such a wish, and the Iqtrab being a translation of that work, the Nawab has simply copied the author of that work in expressing a similar desire. These who do not choose to believe us can satisfy themselves by referring to the Ishah-li-

Ashrat-us-Saha itself. In expressing the possibility of the Mehdi appearing in the 14th century, the author of the Iqtrab has also imitated ancient writers and has not expressed any definite opinion of his own as is clear from the words "perhaps" and "doubtful" with which all such statements are coupled. This can be verified by a perusal of the whole passage from page 219 to 221. At page 219 he quotes from a treatise of Imam Syute that the world will come to an end in 1500 A. H., and at page 220 one author is referred to as having inferred from numerical value of the letters of a verse in the Quran on the subject that the end will come in 1704. Further on, the author states what has been referred to on page 220 and then remarks that, "Hence it is possible that the Mehdi might appear in the beginning of the century. Such a probability is very strong. On the contrary, it should be no wonder if he should appear before the commencement of the century, as the Anti-Christ will appear during the time of the Mehdi at the beginning of the century. It is also probable that the advent of the Mehdi may be delayed till another century and that the next century may not fail to see him."

Again at page 221 he quotes from Abu Qubail that the people will join the Mehdi (admit his mission) in 1204 A. H. He then, in imitation of this unauthenticated statement, makes the remarks referred to at page 221. The author observes:—

"According to this calculation the Mehdi should have appeared in the beginning of the 13th century. The whole of that century has, however, passed without seeing the Mehdi. The 14th century has now come upon our heads. At the time this work was compiled six months of this century were over. Perhaps, it may please God to be kind and merciful and the Mehdi might appear within the next four or six years."

Again, after stating on the same page on the authority of the author of Ishah-li-Ashrat-us-Saha that the world will come to an end in 1076 A. H., the writer observes:—"But this calculation has not turned out to be correct. The 14th century

has commenced. Wars and rumours of war are to be heard from all sides. It remains to be seen what side the camel will sit and what form will our poverty assume." This shows nothing but doubt as to what will happen.

It is curious that the Nawab at page 359 of the *Iljajul Krama fi Asasril Qiama*, after quoting from a treatise entitled *Unquai Maghrab*, written by the author of *Futuhah Macci*, that the Mehdi will appear in 683 A. H., and according to his followers in 710, and according to Yacoob-bin-Ishaq Kindi, in 743, the author reproduces the opposite opinion of Ibn Khaldun, who says that "people pay attention to assertions like these and fix the circumstances of the time of this man's (the true Mehdi's) appearance by various foolish arguments, and when the Mehdi does not appear within that period they evolve other circumstances and conditions out of their own inner consciousness or literary, imaginary, or astrological considerations. People of ancient and modern times have spent their lives in pondering over this subject," and the Mehdi has not appeared. The fact of the Nawab quoting Ibn-Khaldun without contradicting him shows that the various statements concerning them do not represent the opinions of the author who has simply re-echoed the opinions of Syute, Ibn Arab Abu, Qubail, the compiler of Ishahli-Ashrat-us-Saha and other learned men, Sofis and astrologers.

We will give another very curious instance of this which our critics have not brought to the notice of the Government. At page 154 of the *Iqtrab*, the writer quotes the following from Abu Abdulla (whose correctness he knows is questionable) on the authority of Abu Horaira, "my cousins if you find Christ tell him that Abu Horaira gives his compliments to you." The author then says "I ask my children that if any one of them finds Christ (may the peace of God be on him) give my compliments to him. If he should appear during the present century, during my lifetime, then there will be no necessity for their doing so on my behalf, as in that case I will do the same for myself."

In this instance, the Nawab has simply followed the example of Abu Abdul Hakim, inasmuch as notwithstanding the great distance between the advent of Christ and the absence of several signs which are to precede his advent, he talks of paying his compliments to him. These statements are in themselves proofs of the Nawab's simplicity and prove that he has made them in good faith and is in no way disaffected at heart. To infer from these statements that the writer means to excite the Mahomedans to revolt is cruelly false. The three statements to which we refer lead to one result favourable to Government, but which the critics, blinded as they are by prejudice, fail to see. They show that the so called Mehdi is not the true Mehdi, as in that case he should not have expressed a belief in his future appearance or prayed for his appearance. How can a man prophesy about, or pray for, a thing which is already in existence. It is very much to be regretted that the proper and only justifiable inferences that can be drawn from the Nawab's writings are purposely lost sight of, while the utmost efforts are made to find fault with them in order to draw inferences which cannot be drawn. If this is not injustice we fail to see what else can injustice be ?

As regards charge 18, the critics have been guilty of the most barefaced and cruel misrepresentation. It is for this reason that no reference as to pages, &c., is made to the passage on which the charge is based. Nor is there anything of the sort to be found in the parts of the work referred to by them. On the contrary, pages 60 to 66 contain passages conveying quite a contrary meaning. The Nawab states at page 60 that the traditions about the appearance of the Mehdi are trustworthy and observes :—" Chapter on the signs which will precede the end of the world. These signs are also numerous, one of them being the appearance of the Mehdi. This is one of the chief signs of the approach of the last day. The traditions about him, notwithstanding their contradictory character, are many, Mahomed-bin-Hasan Asnavi gives them in the

Manaqab-i-Shafi. There are numerous traditions about the appearance of the Mehdi and his being a Syad.

Similarly Qazi Mahommed-bin-Ali Showkani has recorded the traditions about the descent of Christ, the appearance of the Mehdi and the Anti-Christ. People generally endorse the same view. Ibn-Khaldoon alone questions their trustworthiness. He also questions the revelation of saints about the Mehdi. A reply to his criticisms has been given in the treatise called Iza.

The traditions about the Mehdi, though not contained in the Sahih Bokhari and Sahih Muslim are considered trustworthy by Abu-Daood-Ibn-Maja, Hakim, Tebrani, Abu-Yali Mausli, &c., which after the works of Bokhari and Muslim are trustworthy, especially in the absence of traditions, in the first named books, these latter must be regarded as trustworthy.

These traditions about the Mehdi are confirmatory of each other. The authorities on which they are based are different. Some of them are *sahih*, others are indifferent, while some are weak or unauthenticated. But all sects of Islam are unanimous in the belief that at the end of the world some one from the Ahl-i-Bait (Syad) will appear and that he will strengthen Islam and do justice. The Mahomedans will submit to his authority. He will become the ruler of all Mahomedan countries. He will be called the Mehdi, Jesus Christ and Anti-Christ will appear during his time."

Again on pages 61, 62 and 63, the writer gives some account of the true Mehdi. At first he gives his name as Mahomed or Ahmad, son of Abdulla, without saying anything against it; in another place he states his surname as Abu Abdulla without a word of comment; while in a third place he gives his pedigree and states that he will be from the Ahl-i-Bait and a descendant of Fatima.

This shows very clearly that the writer generally regards those traditions as trustworthy in which it is stated that the Mehdi will be a Sayad and a Fatimite. At the end of this he

remarks that the authority of one Hadis about Abu Daood, &c., is a little weak, *i.e.*, he does not mean to imply that the Hadis itself is untrustworthy but that it is based on an incomplete authority, as in that case, he could not have mentioned as trustworthy the many traditions about the birth of the Mehdi. He then states that his birthplace will be Medina and according to Qurtabi it is stated that he will be born in the west and will come to Medina from his birthplace. Fifthly, he states that the place where people will tender their allegiance to him will be between Ibrahim and Hajar Aswad in Mecca. Sixthly, the place which he will escape will be Jerusalem ; seventhly, he gives the description of the Mehdi, (8) age and (9) his mode of life. He does not question the authenticity of any of these statements (excepting the tradition of Abu Daood). On the contrary, in the Iza and Hijaj-ul-Karma he tries hard to prove the authenticity of these traditions and enters into a spirited refutation of the objections of Ibn Khaldoon and others who question their authenticity, although his refutation is not regarded as conclusive by those who consider these traditions untrustworthy.

At page 65 he gives the following 13 signs by which the Mehdi will be distinguished : (1) He will be in possession of the tunic, sword and banner of the prophet ; (2) A cloud will be over his head to overshadow him and a voice shall proceed from the cloud "this is the Mehdi, the Caliph of God, pay homage to him ;" (3) He will put a dry branch in the earth which will turn green ; (4) When people ask him to prove that he is the true Mehdi he will hold up his hand when a bird will come out of the air and sit on his hand ; (5) An army which will come to oppose him will be buried in the earth ; (6) A voice shall proceed from the heavens that "God has removed the tyrants and the Munafiqs from among you and placed on your head the best of the son of Islam. Join him ; he is the Mehdi ;" (7) The earth will throw out pieces of gold from its bosom ;

(8) People will become contented ; (9) The Mehdi will disinter the treasury of Kaaba and distribute the money among the people ; (10) He will bring out the Tabut-i-Sakina from the Ghar Antakia or Tabria sea ; (11) The river will crack or dry as in the case of the Israelites ; (12) People with black banners will come for him from Khorasan ; (13) He and Jesus Christ will meet together when the latter will offer prayer after him."

In the face of these statements the allegation of the Nawab's critics that he (the Nawab) has attempted to discredit the Hadises about the Mehdi and especially the one about his being a Sayad in order that the Mehdi of Soudan may be easily made the true Mehdi, and that the absence of the distinguishing features may be attributed to the incorrectness of the tradition, and not to any shortcoming in the Mehdi, is an audacious falsehood. It is rather surprising, that when framing this tissue of falsehood and lies, it did not occur to them that it would be impossible to reconcile this with statement number 16, where they have represented the Nawab as praying for the appearance of the Mehdi. In short, they seem to have been under the impression that they would succeed in deceiving the British Government as easily as the servants of Karam Singh deceived their ignorant master, and that the Government will place implicit reliance on anything they might choose to say. They never thought that the imaginary charges preferred by them against the Nawab would not stand an impartial examination and that truth will come out after all.

The statement that in order to conceal his real object the Nawab has here and there referred to the Mehdi as the "False Mehdi, &c.," is equally untrue. The Nawab has not in a single instance referred to him either as the true or false prophet. We trust that no one (provided he is not actuated by hostile feelings against the Ahl-i-Hadis) will, after reading our remarks, doubt that the 18 charges preferred against the Nawab

on the strength of the Iqtrab are either false or greatly exaggerated ; that the passages correctly quoted do not in the least show that they are intended to excite people to rebellion, and that the object of the work is to show that the so-called Mehdi of Soudan is not the true Mehdi, so as to prevent people from considering him the true Mehdi or Mujadad or aiding him, and that those who represent this work as being favourable to the Mehdi have been either the victims of misapprehension or have purposely tried to deceive Government.

The critics of the Nawab also support the charge of inciting the people to rebellion from similar quotations from other works written by the Nawab, but as our article deals in an exhaustive manner, and is not confined to the discussion of the four works in question, we need not refer to them on this occasion. We feel sure that those who carefully and impartially consider our remarks will no longer credit the Nawab with any intention of inciting the people against the Government. We have also every reason to believe that the Government and its official (if they have been imposed upon by the misrepresentations of the Nawab's critics) will, after a careful and sympathetic consideration of our remarks, no longer entertain any doubt as to his loyalty.

We also think it our religious duty (because the prophet says it is religion to give good advice) to say that if these writings are the cause of the Nawab being deprived of his title and salute, the Government will, if they consider this defence satisfactory, restore the Nawab Consort to his former position, as the title and salute was not conferred on him because he was in any way entitled to them, but in consideration of the loyal services rendered by Her Highness the Begum of Bhopal at critical times, and therefore, in case of the Nawab being innocent of the charge of disloyalty it is as necessary to restore the title and salute as it was at first necessary to confer. If, however, Siddiq Hassan Khan has been deprived of his title and salute for any other reason than disloyalty connected with the

affairs of Bhopal, then we venture to think it is quite enough that he should no longer be allowed to interfere in the affairs of the State, but it does not seem appropriate to deprive him also of the title which was conferred in order to please the Begum. In any case, we venture to think that the title and salute of Siddiq Hasan should be restored, though he may not be allowed to have any voice in the affairs of the State.

If the Nawab has been actually guilty of maladministration that is an act for which he is personally responsible, and to deprive him therefore of the title and salute which were conferred on him in consideration of the loyalty of the Begum is to punish the Begum who is quite innocent. Such a treatment cannot command the approval of the public who consider it undignified on the part of Government, however warmly it may be approved by some interested newspapers actuated by hostile feelings against the Nawab. So much for the Nawab;

* * * * *

—

APPENDIX C.

Extracts from my Autobiography.

* * * * *

In point of family I am a Sayad of descent from Fatima, reckoned the best blood among all Mahomedans.

I was born at Canouj in the District of Farakabad, N. W. P. It is the seat of my ancestors and their tombs are yet in existence. My family was considered very respectable and was superior to all the Mahomedan families at Canouj. The whole Mahomedan community in the Upper India were well acquainted with the rank and attainments of my late revered father Syed Aulad Hossein. My father received his training under the fostering care of the distinguished Shah Rafi-u-din, son of the distinguished Shah Wali-Ullah Mahadis of Delhi. My father was distinguished for his literary attainments and had ten thousand disciples under him. He was above all avarice and covetousness; he gave up the Jaiger which was conferred on my ancestors by the Mogul Emperors. My father was by faith a Sunni and was so true to his faith that he did not claim the property and pension of his father a Shea by faith.

My grand-father was the Nawob Syed Aulud Aly Khan Bahadoor "Anwar Jung." He was one of the principal nobles and renowned Jaigirdars under the Nizam-ul-mulk Asaf Jah of Hyderabad. He held a Jaiger with an annual income of five lacs of Rupees and had command of 1000 cavalry and infantry. The pedigree of my father is traced to Syed Jalal of Bokhara "Mukhdum Jahaniyan Jahan Gust."

On my mother's side I claim my descent from a very respectable family. My grand-father was the Mufti Mahomed Awaz of Bareilly. He was highly respected by Asaf Dowla Nawob of Oude and the Nawob Amir Khan of Tonk. * * *

I lost my father when I was only five years old. I went to Cawnpur and other places to prosecute my studies. After learning the rudiments I went to Delhi to complete my education under the tuition of the Mufti Sudirudin Khan Shaheb, the Sadur Sudur of Delhi. Here I was treated very kindly by the Nawob Mustapha Khan who had a high respect for my father, and in fact he treated me as a member of his house.

* * * *

* * * *

Following in the wake of her late talented mother, Her Highness the present Ruler promoted me to posts of high importance. I discharged my duties in the most conscientious way and I rendered every satisfaction to the Ruling Chief

Within the long course of my service I was never censured for negligence, dilatoriness or incapacity. I adopted Bhopal as my native land and I was quite happy with my family and children. To crown my happiness, the Ruler offered me her hand with the concurrence of the members of the Royal family and the officers of the state. The permission of the Government of India was accorded to the proposed alliance and in the presence of the officers of high rank in the state, my marriage was celebrated.

* * * * *

I was raised to an equality of rank and dignity with the late Nawab Baki Mahomed and the title of Nawab Walah Jah Amir-ul-Mulk and a Khilut were conferred on me.

* * * * *

In 1877, at the Delhi Durbar in recognition of my loyal services, the Paramount Power was kind enough to order a salute of seventeen guns.

* * * * *

After my marriage it is my constant aim to secure the approbation of the British Government by my unflinching loyalty and faithful services, and to raise the prosperity of Bhopal which is under an able administratrix who has already been highly talked of by the world. Though I had to sever all connections with the offices of the state I never failed to render service to my beloved wife, kind benefactress and generous Ruler.

The state of Bhopal at the time of my marriage was far from being prosperous. * * * *

The late Nawab Secandar Begum left a heavy debt and the present Ruler was very anxious to liquidate it in the satisfactory way. It was at my suggestion, the Ruler was able to extricate herself from the embarrassments with which the state was beset

* * * * *

* * * * *

Many of the beneficial reforms introduced in the State were done on my advice, and it was a very happy thing to find that a Lady Ruler would not surrender hood-winked to any suggestion made by me. She used to weigh the *pros* and *cons* of every question and on some occasions I was quite surprised to find that Her Highness convinced me by the force of her arguments of the inexpediency and undesirability of some changes and innovations which I suggested. I was struck with the admirable way in which Her Highness could grasp a thing, but when she was once convinced of the propriety and utility of a reform, nothing would deter her to carry it out. It is for this reason she has acquired a fame for her intelligence and administrative skill.

* * * * *

The above mentioned reforms were introduced by Her Highness on my suggestions and they were highly approved of by the British Government and the subjects of the state.

S. H.

